

SINGAPORE

Stakeholder Report for the United Nations Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review (4th Cycle)

Submitted by Capital Punishment Justice Project, Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network, Business Leaders Against the Death Penalty, Center for Prisoners' Rights, The Advocates for Human Rights, the Australian Civil Society Committee on UN Drug Policy, the Julian Wagner Memorial Fund, and the World Coalition Against the Death Penalty

For the 52nd Session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, May 2026
Submitted 10 October 2025

Capital Punishment Justice Project (CPJP) is an Australian-based NGO that stands for a world without the death penalty or other forms of state-sanctioned killing. CPJP works closely with partners in Asia to support the defence of people facing the death penalty, assist local anti-death penalty civil society organisations and campaign to convince governments to abolish the death penalty. Ending the death penalty is one of the Australian Government's human rights priorities and CPJP's work is imperative to ensuring that Australia is a leading voice on abolition.

Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network (ADPAN) is the peak regional body for organisations committed to the abolition of the death penalty across the Asia-Pacific, with members from 20 countries within the region. As such, ADPAN maintains that the death penalty violates the right to life; that it is the ultimate form of cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishment; and that the death penalty should be entirely abolished internationally.

Business Leaders Against the Death Penalty (#BizVsDP) is a global campaign launched in 2021 by the Responsible Business Initiative for Justice and Sir Richard Branson, Founder of Virgin Group. The campaign includes 500+ executives who have declared their commitment to using their voices to abolish the death penalty and advocate for a fairer, safer, and more humane world.

Center for Prisoners' Rights (CPR), founded in 1995, is Japan's first NGO focused on prison reform. It works to align prison conditions with international human rights standards and advocates for the abolition of the death penalty. CPR provides legal support to prisoners, promotes international treaty ratification, and publishes a newsletter highlighting prison litigation, overseas prison visits, and seminar reports, reaching around 5,000 readers including inmates, families, lawyers, and researchers.

The Advocates for Human Rights (The Advocates) is a volunteer-based non-governmental organization committed to the impartial promotion and protection of international human rights standards and the rule of law since its founding in 1983. In 1991, The Advocates adopted a formal commitment to oppose the death penalty worldwide and organized a death penalty project to provide pro bono assistance on post-conviction appeals, as well as education and advocacy to end capital punishment. The Advocates currently holds a seat on the Steering Committee of the World Coalition against the Death Penalty.

The Australian Civil Society Committee on UN Drug Policy is a national network of organisations and individuals working to strengthen Australia's engagement with the United Nations drug policy system through evidence-informed, rights-based, and community-led perspectives. It ensures that the voices of people who use drugs, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, young people, service providers, advocates and researchers are represented in global policymaking on drug-related matters.

The Julian Wagner Memorial Fund was established in 2016 for the charitable purpose of promoting or protecting human rights for the public benefit. It is committed to the worldwide abolition of the death penalty, including by supporting ongoing and strategic anti-death penalty campaigns.

The World Coalition Against the Death Penalty (WCADP), an alliance of more than 150 NGOs, bar associations, local authorities, and unions, was created in Rome on 13 May 2002. The aim of the World Coalition is to strengthen the international dimension of the fight against the death penalty. Its ultimate objective is to obtain the universal abolition of the death penalty. To achieve its goal, the World Coalition advocates for a definitive end to death sentences and executions in those countries where the death penalty is in force. In some countries, it is seeking to obtain a reduction in the use of capital punishment as a first step towards abolition.

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the fourth cycle of the Universal Periodic Review (**UPR**) of Singapore. This submission addresses Singapore's compliance with its human rights obligations with regards to the death penalty.
- 1.2 Singapore extensively uses capital punishment, executing 37 people since resuming executions in March 2022 (following no executions in 2020 and 2021) – predominantly for drug-related offences, contrary to international law and standards. The August 2025 clemency granted to Tristan Tan Yi Rui marked the first since 1998, highlighting the exceptional rarity of such mercy.
- 1.3 This submission addresses:
 - 1.3.1 Aspects of legislation that create arbitrary outcomes in death penalty matters, such as mandatory sentencing, limitations on judicial discretion, and presumptions that reverse the burden of proof.
 - 1.3.2 Alarming developments, such as carrying out executions while court proceedings are ongoing, and the execution of persons with disabilities, despite Singapore being a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
 - 1.3.3 Significant legislative changes through the introduction of the Post-appeal Applications in Capital Cases Act 2022 and amendments to the Administration of Justice (Protection) Act 2016, which further restrict access to justice for persons facing execution, while punitive cost orders can deter lawyers from acting beyond the initial trial and appeal stages.
 - 1.3.4 Severe restrictions on freedom of expression, particularly through the use of the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act 2019, which curtails efforts to raise awareness about the use of the death penalty in Singapore or to present information that differs from the government narrative.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 Singapore retains the death penalty for crimes including murder,¹ kidnapping,² use of firearms³ and certain drug trafficking offences.⁴ Executions are carried out by hanging.
- 2.2 Since March 2022, Singapore has executed 37 people, all of whom were sentenced to the mandatory death penalty:⁵
 - 2.2.1 In 2022, all 11 executions were for drug-related offences;⁶
 - 2.2.2 In 2023, all five executions were for drug-related offences including the first woman to be executed in almost 20 years;⁷
 - 2.2.3 In 2024, eight of the nine executions were for drug-related offences⁸ and one was for murder;⁹ and
 - 2.2.4 In 2025, 10 of the 12 executions carried out to date¹⁰ were for drug-related offences.¹¹ Two were for murder.¹²

2.3 On 14 August 2025, following advice from Cabinet, the President of Singapore, Tharman Shanmugaratnam, granted clemency to Tristan Tan Yi Rui, a 33-year-old Singaporean male sentenced to death in February 2023 for trafficking 337.6 grams of methamphetamine,¹³ 87.6 grams above the legislative threshold for a mandatory death sentence.¹⁴

2.4 The Ministry for Home Affairs said the grant of clemency reduced the disparity in sentencing outcomes between Tan and his co-accused.¹⁵ However, his co-accused was not charged with the same offence as Tan, and was never eligible for the same sentence.¹⁶ This is the first grant of clemency made in Singapore since 1998, with, to date, at least 252 executions taking place since then.¹⁷ Civil society organisations noted this was long overdue given the UN Human Rights Committee requires all clemency applications must be “meaningfully considered.”¹⁸

2.5 In stark contrast, in September 2025, Datchinamurthy a/l Kataiah (Datch), a 39-year-old Malaysian male was executed having spent over a decade on death row for drug offences following being mandatorily sentenced to death.¹⁹

2.5.1 On 13 September 2025, a clemency appeal was submitted on behalf of Datch.²⁰

2.5.2 On 20 September 2025, the notice of execution was received.²¹

2.5.3 The execution was scheduled to take place at 6.00am on 25 September 2025. The family were advised around five hours prior to the scheduled time that the execution was put on hold as the President of Singapore was considering granting clemency. The clemency appeal had been submitted 12 days prior.

2.5.4 At around 1.40pm that same day, the family were notified that clemency had been rejected and by 3.00pm they were asked to identify Datch’s body at the prison.²²

2.5.5 They were not afforded the chance to see or speak to Datch during this time.²³ N. Surendran, a Malaysian lawyer representing Datch’s family, noted that: “This is an act of cruelty....To pretend to give a reprieve to Datch, raise his hopes and his family’s hopes, and then to plunge them into horror and despair again, is unforgivable and uncivilized.”²⁴

2.6 Worldwide in 2024, “Amnesty International and Harm Reduction International recorded over 600 drug-related executions, which constituted around 40% of total executions globally (1,518) and a 25% increase on the known total executions for these offences in 2023 (508 out of 1,153), making 2024 the deadliest year on record since 2015.”²⁵

2.7 Despite such significant numbers, executions for drug-related offences are carried out by a very small group of countries, including Singapore:

2022	China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore ²⁶
2023	China, Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore ²⁷
2024	China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore ²⁸

2.8 While Singapore is not a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (**ICCPR**), executing for drug-related offences breaches international law. The United Nations (**UN**) Human Rights Committee states that Article 6(2)'s 'most serious crimes' threshold:²⁹

"[M]ust be read restrictively and appertain only to crimes of extreme gravity involving intentional killing. Crimes not resulting directly and intentionally in death, such as... drug... offences, although serious in nature, can never serve as the basis, within the framework of article 6, for the imposition of the death penalty."³⁰

2.9 UN bodies have called for states to abolish the death penalty for drug-related offences.³¹ Notably, the three UN Drug Conventions do not make any reference to the death penalty, while several UN human rights and drug control bodies have reiterated their total opposition to the death penalty, including for drug-related offences.³²

3. Arbitrary use of the death penalty

3.1 Mandatory sentences are inherently arbitrary, leaving no judicial discretion to consider an offender's particular circumstances or whether the offence warrants death.³³ This inability of courts to consider case-specific circumstances exacerbates inherent biases in criminal justice systems, undermining the principle of equality before the law. Without judicial discretion to weigh individual factors, sentencing outcomes can be determined by "structural and systemic challenges embedded in the criminal justice system itself – turning the death penalty inevitably into a 'lethal lottery'."³⁴

3.2 Accordingly, there is an over-representation of racial minorities on death row in Singapore.³⁵ In 2022, UN experts corroborated that a "disproportionate number of minority persons were being sentenced to the mandatory death penalty in Singapore."³⁶

3.3 In January 2013, mandatory death penalty provisions were removed in relation to certain drug offences, allowing courts the discretion to impose either the death penalty or life imprisonment and 15 strokes of the cane³⁷ where:

3.3.1 The defendant is acting as a 'courier';³⁸ and

3.3.2 The Public Prosecutor certifies that the defendant has "substantively assisted the Central Narcotics Bureau in disrupting drug trafficking activities within or outside Singapore";³⁹ or

3.3.3 The defendant was suffering from an abnormality of the mind which substantially impaired their mental responsibility for their acts and omissions in relation to their offending.⁴⁰

3.4 While allowing discretion in sentencing was a positive step, the requirement that a Certificate of Substantive Assistance (**Certificate**) be granted at the sole discretion of the Public Prosecutor is highly problematic, as:

3.4.1 A courier is highly unlikely to have sufficient information to disrupt drug trafficking activities by the very nature of their lower degree of culpability and involvement in trafficking drugs;

- 3.4.2 Even if the defendant can furnish sufficient information, they will not be granted a Certificate if that information was already in the prosecution's possession;⁴¹ and
- 3.4.3 The process gives the Public Prosecutor an inordinate degree of influence over the sentencing, effectively transferring fact-finding and sentencing powers from the judiciary to the executive. This compromises the principle of separation of power and undermines the right to a fair trial.⁴²

3.5 The Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 allows for:

- 3.5.1 the legal presumption of trafficking, based on the amount of drugs a person is found with;⁴³ and
- 3.5.2 the legal presumption of possession and knowledge, based on having a controlled drug or psychoactive substance in one's possession.⁴⁴

3.6 These provisions require the defendant to provide evidence to rebut the presumption that they intended to traffic drugs on the 'balance of probabilities', undermining the presumption of innocence which is a peremptory norm of customary international law.⁴⁵ This shifts the burden of proof from the prosecution, weakening fair trial guarantees at international law.⁴⁶ Ultimately, death sentences are mandatorily imposed following convictions where the evidentiary standards do not meet fair trial guarantees under international law.

4. Executing persons while court proceedings are ongoing

4.1 Alarmingly, since August 2024 a number of executions have taken place in Singapore while ongoing court proceedings, including civil applications, were on foot.

4.2 In August 2024, Singapore executed two men, despite both being parties to a pending civil action and one having a pending criminal review application.⁴⁷

4.3 Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari was executed on 4 October 2024 despite being party to a civil application to review the constitutionality of provisions of the Post-appeal Applications in Capital Cases Act (**PACC Act**).⁴⁸ Sulaiman bin Jumari was executed on 16 October 2024 and was also party to that same proceeding.⁴⁹ Both individuals raised this point when seeking permission to file a post-appeal application once they received their execution notices – neither had legal representation and both applications were dismissed without an oral hearing.⁵⁰

4.4 On 16 February 2025, Pannir Selvam Pranthaman received notice that his execution was scheduled for 20 February 2025.⁵¹ On 19 February 2025, he applied for permission to make a post-appeal application, with one of the grounds being that he had filed a complaint to the Law Society of Singapore against his former lawyer, Ong Ying Ping, that was yet to be determined. A stay of execution was granted to allow him to make the application.⁵²

4.5 In March 2025, the Law Council of Australia noted "this complaint may have compromised Mr Pannir's right to challenge his conviction and sentence," and "urged the Law Society [of Singapore] to seek a stay of execution until the complaint could be properly investigated and adjudicated."⁵³

4.6 On 5 September 2025, the Court of Appeal dismissed Pannir's application, distinguishing between the types of court proceedings that would prevent an execution notice from being

issued, i.e., proceedings that may affect conviction and/or sentence and those “ordinarily not regarded as relevant”.⁵⁴ The Court noted the Ministry of Home Affairs’ policy that “non-State-brought proceedings” are not regarded as “relevant proceedings” and, therefore, do not prevent an execution notice from being issued “even if they require a PACP’s [prisoner awaiting capital punishment] testimony.”⁵⁵ The Court reasoned that “[t]he principle of finality...requires nothing less.”⁵⁶ Noting the practical implications of executing a person prior to them giving evidence, the Court advised that “it may be necessary for the Law Society to expedite these proceedings or to take steps to record or otherwise preserve the evidence of the PACP before he is executed.”⁵⁷

- 4.7 Two other persons on death row filed similar complaints regarding the same set of circumstances as Pannir, yet were executed while their complaints were also on foot.⁵⁸ One other had highlighted their intention to bring a complaint against the solicitor when bringing an application for stay of execution.⁵⁹ None of their testimony was ‘preserved’ in advance.
- 4.8 Human rights organisations emphasise prioritising fair trial rights over finality:

“Pannir’s involvement – to instruct counsel, give testimony and respond to any evidence raised by his former lawyer – is the only way to ensure a fair outcome in his complaint lodged with the Law Society of Singapore. This is especially critical given that the complaint includes a direct conversation involving Pannir and his former lawyer and that several other persons on death row who had also filed complaints against this same lawyer have already been executed before their testimonies could be heard.”⁶⁰
- 4.9 On 4 October 2025, Pannir was notified his execution had been scheduled with a shortened notification period. Despite calls to halt his execution, including from the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions,⁶¹ the Malaysian Bar⁶² and the Commonwealth Lawyers Association,⁶³ Pannir was hanged on 8 October 2025.⁶⁴
- 4.10 Prior to his execution, the Law Society of Singapore did not meet with Pannir to preserve his testimony.
- 4.11 The Government of Singapore should ensure the highest standards of natural justice and fair trial guarantees are adhered to – executing individuals before their proceedings are concluded is an affront to natural justice. The distinction between types of proceedings on foot is nonsensical and undermines international law standards. Safeguard No. 8 of the UN Safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of those facing the death penalty states that “[c]apital punishment shall not be carried out pending any appeal or other recourse procedure or other proceeding relating to pardon or commutation of the sentence.”⁶⁵ Additionally, General Comment No. 32 of the UN Human Rights Committee emphasises that the right to appeal conviction and sentence should have a procedure that “allows for due consideration of the nature of the case,” in accordance with Article 14(5) of the ICCPR.⁶⁶

5. Executing persons living with disabilities

- 5.1 On 27 April 2022, Nagaenthran a/l K Dharmalingam was executed following his conviction for trafficking 42.72 grams of diamorphine, which attracted a mandatory death sentence.⁶⁷

Despite being found to have borderline intellectual functioning,⁶⁸ a Full Scale Intelligence Quotient score of 69⁶⁹ and a diagnosis of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (**ADHD**),⁷⁰ he was not found to be suffering from an 'abnormality of mind'⁷¹ and, so, was not eligible to be re-sentenced to life imprisonment.

- 5.2 In November 2021, We Who Witness,⁷² noted that Nagaenthran had "difficulties with attention, verbal fluency, set-shifting, abstract reasoning, strategy formation and problem solving, and may have had difficulties in knowing who to trust."⁷³ Even if he did not meet the legal threshold for 'abnormality of mind', the reality was that Nagaenthran lived with disabilities.⁷⁴
- 5.3 In 2017, Roslan Bin Baker and Pausi Bin Jefridin were assessed by psychiatrists to have intellectual and psychosocial disabilities,⁷⁵ while Rosman bin Abdullah was assessed by a psychiatrist as likely to have ADHD.⁷⁶ Roslan and Pausi were executed on 15 November 2024 and Rosman was executed on 22 November 2024.⁷⁷
- 5.4 The Government of Singapore signed the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (**CRPD**) in July 2013, although they are yet to implement it into domestic legislation. In March 2022, at Nagaenthran's final hearing, the Court of Appeal noted:

"Further, there is no basis for holding that Declaration 6 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons or Art 15 of the [CRPD] have the force of law in Singapore absent the adoption of these principles and provisions into the domestic legislative framework."⁷⁸
- 5.5 While the Court of Appeal found these disabilities did not amount to the 'abnormality of mind' threshold to allow discretion regarding sentencing, they still ought to have triggered access to procedural accommodations to comply with the CRPD's intentions.
- 5.6 Noting that Roslan was self-represented on his application for permission to lodge a post-appeal application,⁷⁹ there should also have been efforts by Singapore to "take appropriate measures to provide access by persons with disabilities to the support they may require in exercising their legal capacity."⁸⁰

6. Access to justice

- 6.1 The Government of Singapore has implemented several legislative and policy changes raising the legal threshold and limiting the access of persons on death row to review of their cases once a clemency application has been determined.
- 6.2 After the Court of Appeal has upheld a conviction and sentence, the only legal avenues open are a post-appeal review or application for stay of execution. The very limited legislative scope to re-open an application,⁸¹ combined with the strict judicial approach to such cases, means that an applicant has scant prospects for a successful application.⁸²
- 6.3 Punitive cost orders have forced persons on death row to represent themselves in legal proceedings, obstructing their right to a fair trial. In 2022, the Court of Appeal made personal cost orders against two lawyers for acting "improperly, unreasonably or negligently" while representing a person on death row in appeal proceedings.⁸³
- 6.4 In August 2022, 24 persons on death row filed a lawsuit without legal representation, claiming that the use of prohibitive cost orders on Counsel was deterring lawyers and

obstructing their constitutional right to access to justice.⁸⁴ Such punitive cost orders violate Principle 16 of the UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, which requires they be able to perform their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference.⁸⁵

- 6.5 In May 2024, the High Court struck out an application by 36 persons on death row who filed a lawsuit – also without legal representation – challenging the policy of the Legal Aid Scheme for Capital Offenses (**LASCO**) to not assign legal counsel to persons on death row seeking to make a post-appeal application.⁸⁶ An appeal was dismissed on 9 September 2024.⁸⁷
- 6.6 The PACC Act came into effect on 28 June 2024, further limiting the legal avenues open to persons on death row. The PACC Act creates a number of hurdles, including:
 - 6.6.1 An application to stay an execution requires prior approval from a judge of the Court of Appeal before being filed and heard.⁸⁸ Ostensibly this prevents the misuse of judicial resources through ‘last-minute’ applications. In determining whether to grant approval, the judge must take into account the quality, relevance and recency of the evidence presented, as well as the prospects of the application’s success.⁸⁹
 - 6.6.2 An individual must first apply for permission from a Court of Appeal judge, through a written submission.⁹⁰ Applicants cannot speak to their submissions, or respond to allegations of facts or legal arguments levelled against them.
 - 6.6.3 As a PACC application is initiated in the Court of Appeal, there is no right to appeal decisions,⁹¹ even where a judge has made a clear error of law.
 - 6.6.4 If an applicant has previously made unsuccessful applications and has been deemed to have committed an abuse of process, the requirements become even more stringent.⁹² Two additional barriers will be imposed, namely, whether the applicant is relying on new evidence that could not have been presented earlier, even with reasonable diligence, and whether the application is delayed.⁹³ There are no legislative provisions identifying what is considered a delay. Alarmingly, an applicant who has previously been deemed to have abused the process of court may be executed despite there being an ongoing application for permission.⁹⁴
 - 6.6.5 The judiciary can act against individuals or lawyers who are alleged to have “abused the process of the court”,⁹⁵ including those who file late-stage applications that could delay executions. The Court of Appeal, the Public Prosecutor, or the Attorney-General can all raise concerns about a lawyer’s conduct.⁹⁶
- 6.7 Since the PACC Act came into effect, at least ten individuals have made post-appeal applications.⁹⁷ All but one were dismissed summarily⁹⁸ and only one applicant had legal representation at the time of filing the application.⁹⁹
- 6.8 On 8 May 2024, then Minister for Law and Home Affairs, K Shanmugam, delivered a speech on Singapore’s National Drug Control Policy in Parliament. He announced the PACC Act was to come into force and noted:

“We are now considering what else needs to be done to make sure this new legislation can be properly supported. We will come back to the House if necessary. And I wish

to make it clear to members and Singaporeans – be assured that we will take all necessary steps to ensure that this sort of abuse of process is dealt with.”¹⁰⁰

6.9 Minister Shanmugam indicated such ‘necessary steps’ may include the government making constitutional amendments to prevent further constitutional challenges from succeeding.¹⁰¹

6.10 These comments by Minister Shanmugam raise concerning implications of this legislative policy on the fair trial rights of persons on death row in Singapore. There have been at least three cases since 2012 where post-conviction appeals have resulted in stays of execution being granted, demonstrating that those cases had the requisite merit.¹⁰² The principle of finality of judgment appears to be given greater weight than evidence that could result in a different sentencing outcome.

6.11 On 13 November 2024, the Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Bill was read for a second time in the Parliament of Singapore and passed that same day.¹⁰³ The Second Reading Speech referred to the necessity to address the phenomenon of ‘lawfare’, stating:

“Cases of abuse of court processes are becoming more common in Singapore and overseas, as parties engage in ‘lawfare’ – commencing unmeritorious claims to oppress others and/or for ulterior purposes.”¹⁰⁴

6.12 By using the term ‘lawfare’ the Government of Singapore is misusing a concept that refers to the practice of authoritarian regimes using legal mechanisms to intimidate and silence human rights defenders.

6.13 The amendments broaden the definition of contempt of court to include anyone who knowingly files a court proceeding that “is manifestly groundless or without foundation, and involves the process of the court being employed for some ulterior or improper purpose”¹⁰⁵ or “conducts or commences multiple or successive court proceedings (whether as a party or an advocate in those court proceedings), and knows or ought to know that his or her conduct or commencement of those court proceedings is manifestly groundless or without foundation”.¹⁰⁶

6.14 These provisions would apply to persons on death row who attempt to make any post-appeal applications, despite the PACC Act’s already extremely difficult threshold for permitting such applications.

6.15 Critically, the amendments also extend liability for contempt of court to anyone who “causes or abets” others to “conduct or commence” such proceedings.¹⁰⁷ This creates a chilling effect on family members, civil society members and individuals who currently support self-represented persons on death row in preparing applications, and could extend to other people, such as Commissioners of Oath, who attend prisons to witness affidavits. Lay persons, including people on death row, should not be expected to determine whether proceedings are ‘manifestly groundless or without foundation’ without legal advice.

6.16 These amendments aim to deter people from assisting persons on death row in any legal proceedings beyond their trial and appeal hearings. This leaves persons on death row further isolated and unable to access justice.

7. Reduced notification period

7.1 Prior to June 2024, persons on death row were given at least seven days' notice before execution. This was a brief, but critical, window in which they could finalise their affairs, see family, and file legal challenges. However, this notice period has been reduced to approximately four to five days for those who have previously been notified of their execution date and subsequently granted a stay of execution. This substantially narrows the opportunity to exercise legal rights in the final days of their lives.

7.2 In October 2024, Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari, a Singaporean national on death row, challenged the shortened notification timeline. In his judgment, Judge Tay noted that the Ministry of Home Affairs (**MHA**) had revised its policy such that individuals whose executions had been stayed or postponed after receiving an initial notice would receive a shorter 'Renotification Period'.¹⁰⁸ The MHA maintained that such individuals would still have received at least seven days, in total, to settle their affairs, including time accrued under the original notice.¹⁰⁹

7.3 This rationale is flawed. A notification period ought to be tied to the warrant that was issued – so if the execution is stayed by the Court of Appeal or the President orders a respite of the execution warrant,¹¹⁰ then that notification period expires and a new notification period commences if a new execution warrant is issued. With only a few days' notice, these individuals, who are usually without legal counsel, are unlikely to be able to access, prepare, or file any viable legal challenge, particularly given the heavy procedural and evidentiary burdens on post-appeal applications. Ensuring adequate time and support for final legal and personal steps is not only a matter of compassion but a necessary safeguard to the right to a fair trial.

8. Limitations on freedom of expression

8.1 Freedom of expression is protected in Article 14(1) of the Singaporean Constitution, which explicitly grants citizens the rights to "freedom of speech and expression", "assemble peaceably and without arms", and "form associations".¹¹¹ However, Article 14(2) allows Parliament to impose restrictions on these rights, including if such restrictions are in the interests of the security of Singapore, public order, or to provide against contempt of court.¹¹²

8.2 The Public Order Act 2009 prohibits public assembly unless a police permit is obtained.¹¹³ Only citizens are entitled to participate¹¹⁴ and police have broad discretion to refuse to issue permits where it "is necessary in the public interest to do so".¹¹⁵ One exception is the designated 'Speakers' Corner' at Hong Lim Park, where protests can take place without prior approval, subject to strict conditions.¹¹⁶ A Singaporean activist is currently charged in relation to allegedly attending five candlelight vigils marking imminent executions without having the requisite permits.¹¹⁷

8.3 It is within this context of 'repressed' civic space that protests against the death penalty have taken place.¹¹⁸ On 4 April 2022, more than 400 Singaporean residents gathered in the Speakers' Corner to protest against the impending execution of Nagaenthran.¹¹⁹ This was noted to be a "sizeable crowd in the Singaporean context".¹²⁰ On 19 February 2025, 200 Singaporean residents attended the same location for a candlelight vigil to protest

against the scheduled execution of Pannir Selvam Pranthaman and commemorate the 12 executions that took place in the preceding 12 months.¹²¹

- 8.4 The 2019 enactment of the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act 2019 (**POFMA**) allows any Minister to issue a ‘Correction Direction’¹²² or ‘Stop Communication Direction’¹²³ if the Minister is satisfied that “a false statement of fact... has been or is being communicated in Singapore; [and] ...it is in the public interest to issue the Direction.”¹²⁴
- 8.5 A Correction Direction requires a person, within a specified time period, to post a correction notice, for a set period of time, on a specified online platform stating that the specified statement was false.¹²⁵ A Stop Communication Direction requires the person to stop repeating the statement that is said to be false “even if the person does not know or has no reason to believe that the statement is false.”¹²⁶
- 8.6 A conviction for an individual knowingly or reasonably believing they are making a false statement of fact that is likely to have a broad range of outcomes can result in fines or imprisonment,¹²⁷ while a corporation can be fined up to S\$500,000.¹²⁸ The Minister can also issue an ‘Access blocking order’ requiring “the internet access service provider to take reasonable steps to disable access by end-users in Singapore to the online location”.¹²⁹ In cases where three false statements have been deemed to be made within a six-month period, the Minister can declare the online platform a ‘Declared online location’.¹³⁰ It then becomes an offence for any person to derive any financial benefit from the online location in question¹³¹ or to provide financial support to the declared online location.¹³²
- 8.7 Critics of POFMA have claimed that it is overused to protect the government from genuine criticism¹³³ – at least 142 Correction Directions have been issued since enactment.¹³⁴ Experts caution that “[t]here is... the danger of the ‘chilling’ of speech, which may plausibly be considered an opinion rather than a false statement of fact”.¹³⁵
- 8.8 Concerns have also been raised that POFMA is used “to harass or prosecute anyone for expressing disagreeable opinions rather than engaging with its critics.”¹³⁶ Transformative Justice Collective (**TJC**), a Singapore-based civil society group, works on raising death penalty awareness and supporting those on death row.¹³⁷ Much of their awareness-raising has utilised online forums to tell the stories of persons on death row and share webinars and articles.¹³⁸
- 8.9 Since 2023, TJC has received seven POFMA notices. Five were issued within a five-month period between August and December 2024.¹³⁹ Individual members of TJC have also received individual POFMA notices.¹⁴⁰
- 8.10 On 8 May 2024, during a parliamentary speech, the then Law and Home Affairs Minister, K Shanmugam, publicly ‘doxed’ five anti-death penalty advocates and organisations who had been subject to a POFMA direction, including placing the email address of a human rights defender on the parliamentary record.¹⁴¹ The public shaming of these human rights defenders by the Law Minister would seem to be directed at tarnishing their credibility and discouraging others from commenting on the death penalty with a critical lens.
- 8.11 On 20 December 2024, the Minister of Digital Development and Information issued a two-year ‘Declared online location’ order to TJC. The order required TJC to place a notice on all their online platforms to inform any viewers that their platforms “had communicated

multiple falsehoods, and that viewers should exercise caution when accessing it for information.”¹⁴²

- 8.12 This has stifled TJC’s ability to use their online platforms, having the chilling effect of reducing awareness about the state’s ongoing use of the death penalty and undermining public trust in information shared by TJC. The ‘Declared online location’ notice places “an undue restriction on the right to freedom of expression, create[s] a climate of fear and ha[s] the effect of stifling debates on the human rights concerns surrounding the use of the death penalty in Singapore.”¹⁴³
- 8.13 On 27 January 2025, TJC and three of its members were individually summoned for criminal investigations under section 7 of POFMA in respect of the correction directions issued to TJC between August and December 2024. Three members of TJC spent a total of 25 hours in police interviews relating to these investigations.¹⁴⁴
- 8.14 Concerningly, POFMA purports to have extraterritorial scope to jurisdictions beyond Singapore, capable of prosecuting persons and corporations “whether in or outside Singapore”.¹⁴⁵ In October 2024, the Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network, an NGO then based in Malaysia, received correction directions regarding posts on Facebook, Instagram and LinkedIn.¹⁴⁶

9. Recommendations

- 9.1 This stakeholder report makes the following recommendations for the Government of Singapore:
 - 9.1.1 Ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), its Second Optional Protocol aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, and the Convention against Torture.
 - 9.1.2 Implement the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) within the domestic legal framework and ensure that all persons living with disabilities are afforded appropriate accommodations when interacting with the criminal justice system at all stages.
 - 9.1.3 Impose an immediate moratorium on executions with a view to the ultimate abolition of the death penalty.
 - 9.1.4 Abolish the death penalty and replace it with sentencing options that are fair, proportionate and in compliance with international human rights standards. In the interim:
 - 9.1.4.1 Ensure that any sentence of death complies with the ‘most serious crimes’ threshold as per Article 6 of the ICCPR and defined in *General Comment No. 36, Article 6: Right to Life*.¹⁴⁷
 - 9.1.4.2 Eliminate the mandatory death penalty and provide courts with full judicial discretion to determine whether the death penalty should be imposed, taking into account the facts and circumstances of the offence, as well as any mitigating considerations relating to the defendant, in determining an

appropriate penalty. This includes removing the cooperation framework set out in Section 33B of the Misuse of Drugs Act.

- 9.1.4.3 Amend the Misuse of Drugs Act to remove the s17, s18, and s18A presumptions provisions to ensure that the burden of proof in capital cases remains with the prosecution.
- 9.1.4.4 Ensure that all persons facing a capital charge and/or conviction have legal representation from the time of arrest until the time the person is escorted to the gallows. Ensure that capital defence lawyers are appropriately funded to act in these circumstances and that cost orders are not used as a punitive measure against capital defence lawyers.
- 9.1.4.5 Repeal the amendments made via the Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Act 2024 that extends liability for contempt of court to lay persons assisting persons on death row.
- 9.1.4.6 Cease the practice of providing an abridged renotification period when issuing a notice of execution for persons on death row who have previously received a stay. The notification period, regardless of previous notices, for those on death row should be a minimum of seven days, to allow them the full range of opportunities to say their final farewells, settle personal matters, or exercise their legal right to judicial review.
- 9.1.4.7 In light of the granting of clemency to a person on death row in August 2025, review the clemency applications of every person currently on death row.
- 9.1.4.8 Ensure that applications under the Post-appeal Applications in Capital Cases (PACC) Act are determined by oral hearings where applicants are provided with legal representation to allow proper consideration of the substantive issues by the Court. Amend s 60G(13) of the PACC Act to allow for judicial review of PACC hearings.
- 9.1.4.9 Publish timely, transparent and comprehensive data on death sentences, the current death row population and executions, disaggregated by nationality, race/ethnicity, crime of conviction, age, status of the case, and gender, to reveal whether the death penalty has a disproportionate effect on minority groups, particularly people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

- 9.1.5 Repeal domestic laws authorising restrictions on freedom of expression and assembly that contradict international norms, such as POFMA. Further safeguards and protections should be issued to journalists and activists who challenge the government's position on the death penalty.
- 9.1.6 End the intimidation and harassment of human rights defenders, social media users and government critics, including through the misuse of the criminal justice system, and ensure human rights defenders can carry out their work without fear of reprisals.

9.1.7 Implement the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Committee's 2024 recommendations on women's access to justice.¹⁴⁸

9.1.8 Repeal legislative authorisation for use of detention without trial, such as the Internal Security Act and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act.

¹ Mandatory and discretionary death penalty, s 302, Penal Code 1871 (Singapore)

<<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/act/pc1871?ProvlDs=P416-#pr302->>.

² Discretionary death penalty, s 3, Kidnapping Act 1961 (Singapore) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/KA1961#pr3->>.

³ Mandatory death penalty, ss 4, 4A, 5, Arms Offences Act 1973 (Singapore)

<<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/AOA1973#pr4->>.

⁴ Mandatory and discretionary death penalty, Schedule 2, Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 (Singapore)

<<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/MDA1973?ValidDate=20251010&TransactionDate=20251010&ProvlDs=Sc2-#Sc2->>; S 33B, Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 (Singapore) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/MDA1973?ProvlDs=P13-#pr33B->>.

⁵ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2022* (Global Report, 16 May 2023) p.25

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/6548/2023/en/>>; Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2023* (Global Report, 29 May 2024) p.24

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/7952/2024/en/>>; Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2024* (Global Report, 8 April 2025) p.26

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8976/2025/en/>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 23 January 2025' (News, 23 January 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---23-january-2025>>; Singapore Police Force, 'Execution of a Convicted Murderer' (Police News Release, 5 February 2025)

<https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2025/02/20250205_execution_of_a_convicted_murderer>; Public Prosecutor v Iskandar bin Rahmat [2015] SGHC 310 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2015_SGHC_310>; Central

Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 7 February 2025' (News, 7 February 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---7-february-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 9 April 2025' (News, 9 April 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---9-april-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 10 April 2025' (News, 10 April 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---10-april-2025>>; Singapore Police Force, 'Execution of a Convicted Murderer' (Police News Release, 16 April 2025)

<https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2025/04/20250416_execution_of_a_convicted_murderer>; Public

Prosecutor v Teo Ghim Heng (Zhang Jinxing) [2021] SGHC 13 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2021_SGHC_13>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug

Trafficker – 23 May 2025' (News, 23 May 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---23-may-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 25 July 2025' (News, 25 July 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---25-july-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 30 July 2025' (News, 30 July 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---30-july-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 13 August 2025' (News, 13 August 2025)

<<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---13-august-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 25 September 2025' (News, 25 September 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---25-september-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Importer' (News, 8 October 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-importer>>.

⁶ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2022* (Global Report, 16 May 2023) p.8

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/6548/2023/en/>>.

⁷ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2023* (Global Report, 29 May 2024) pp.9, 14

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/7952/2024/en/>>; See, also, Rebecca Ratcliffe, 'Singapore executes a woman for first time in almost two decades', *The Guardian* (online, 28 July 2023)

<<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2023/jul/28/singapore-woman-execute-death-penalty-saridewi-djamani-executed>>.

⁸ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2024* (Global Report, 8 April 2025) p.14

<<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8976/2025/en/>>.

⁹ Singapore Police Force, 'Execution of Convicted Murderer' (Police News Release, 28 February 2024)

<https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2024/20240228_execution_of_convicted_murderer>; Samuel Deveraj, 'Man who killed ex-fiancée is first person to be executed for murder in Singapore since 2019', *The*

Straits Times (online, 28 February 2024) <<https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/courts-crime/man-who-killed-ex-fiancee-is-first-person-to-be-executed-for-murder-in-singapore-since-2019>>.

¹⁰ As of submission of this stakeholder report on 10 October 2025.

¹¹ Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 23 January 2025' (News, 23 January 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---23-january-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 7 February 2025' (News, 7 February 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---7-february-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 9 April 2025' (News, 9 April 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---9-april-2025>>; 'Central Narcotics Bureau, Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 10 April 2025' (News, 10 April 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---10-april-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 23 May 2025' (News, 23 May 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---23-may-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 25 July 2025' (News, 25 July 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---25-july-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 30 July 2025' (News, 30 July 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---30-july-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 13 August 2025' (News, 13 August 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---13-august-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 25 September 2025' (News, 25 September 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---25-september-2025>>; Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Importer' (News, 8 October 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-importer>>.

¹² Singapore Police Force, 'Execution of a Convicted Murderer' (Police News Release, 5 February 2025) <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2025/02/20250205_execution_of_a_convicted_murderer>; Singapore Police Force, 'Execution of a Convicted Murderer' (Police News Release, 16 April 2025) <https://www.police.gov.sg/Media-Hub/News/2025/04/20250416_execution_of_a_convicted_murderer>; Lutfil Jumadi, 'Singapore hangs ex-police officer convicted of Kovan double murder', *Channel News Asia* (online, 5 February 2025) <<https://www.channelnewsasia.com/singapore/iskandar-rahmat-death-penalty-hanging-former-police-officer-kovan-double-murders-4917511>>; Delegation of the European Union to Singapore, 'Joint Local Statement following an execution on 16 April 2025' (17 April 2025) <https://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/singapore/joint-local-statement-following-execution-16-april-2025_en>.

¹³ Selina Lum, 'Drug trafficker gets death sentence commuted after President Tharman grants clemency', *The Straits Times* (online, 15 August 2025) <<https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/courts-crime/man-on-death-row-granted-clemency-in-rare-move-to-reduce-disparity-between-outcomes>>.

¹⁴ Schedule 2, Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 (Singapore) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/MDA1973?ValidDate=20251010&TransactionDate=20251010&ProvIds=Sc2-%23Sc2>>.

¹⁵ Selina Lum, 'Drug trafficker gets death sentence commuted after President Tharman grants clemency', *The Straits Times* (online, 15 August 2025) <<https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/courts-crime/man-on-death-row-granted-clemency-in-rare-move-to-reduce-disparity-between-outcomes>>.

¹⁶ Terry Xu, 'When clemency logic falters: A tale of three cases', *The Online Citizen* (online, 16 August 2025) <<https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2025/08/16/when-clemency-logic-falters-a-tale-of-three-cases>>; Public Prosecutor v Tan Yi Rui Tristan [2023] SGHC 173 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2023_SGHC_173>; Public Prosecutor v Muhammad Hakam bin Suliman [2022] SGHC 160 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2022_SGHC_160>.

¹⁷ Fiona Low & Tham Yuen-C, 'Fewer criminals sent to the gallows', *The Straits Times* (1 March 2012) p.88; Singapore Prison Service, 'Judicial Executions', data.gov.sg (Web Page, accessed 9 October 2025) <https://data.gov.sg/datasets/d_f4081559b7db4f792a395138a540db1d/view>; For the 37 executions since March 2022, see Endnote 5.

¹⁸ Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: Call for death penalty moratorium renewed after first clemency since 1998 and third execution in three weeks' (Joint Statement, 22 August 2025) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0218/2025/en/>>.

¹⁹ Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 25 September 2025' (News, 25 September 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker---25-september-2025>>.

²⁰ Kirsten Han, '14 September 2025: Four families appeal for clemency for their loved ones on death row', *We, The Citizens* (Blog Post, 14 September 2025) <<https://www.wethecitizens.net/14-september-2025-four-families-appeal-for-clemency-for-their-loved-ones-on-death-row/>>; Chloe Loh, 'Group submits clemency appeal for death row inmates at Istana, police looking into matter', *Mothership* (online, 23 September 2025) <https://mothership.sg/2025/09/group-submits-clemency-appeal-for-death-row-inmates-at-istana-police-investigating>.

²¹ Amnesty International & Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network, 'Singapore: Cruel and unlawful drug-related execution of Malaysian man renews urgency for moratorium on executions' (Joint Statement, 27 September 2025) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ACT50/0341/2025/en/>>.

²² Ibid; Kirsten Han, 'No more. Not in my name.', *We, The Citizens* (Blog Post, 26 September 2025) <<https://www.wethecitizens.net/no-more-not-in-my-name/>>.

Submission made by Capital Punishment Justice Project, Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network, Business Leaders Against the Death Penalty, Center for Prisoners' Rights, The Advocates for Human Rights, the Australian Civil Society Committee on UN Drug Policy, the Julian Wagner Memorial Fund, and the World Coalition Against the Death Penalty.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ The Associated Press, 'Singapore executes Malaysian drug trafficker, city-state's 11th execution of the year', ABC News Network (online, 25 September 2025) <<https://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/singapore-executes-malaysian-drug-trafficker-city-states-11th-125918883>>.

²⁵ Amnesty International, Harm Reduction International and Ors, '2025 World Drug Day: UNODC and CND must take urgent action to end unlawful use of the death penalty for drug-related offences' (Joint Statement, 25 June 2025) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/9537/2025/en/>><<https://hri.global/publications/unodc-and-cnd-should-take-urgent-action-against-death-penalty-for-drugs/>>.

²⁶ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2022* (Global Report, 16 May 2023) p.14 <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/6548/2023/en/>>; Harm Reduction International, *The Death Penalty for Drug Offences: Global Overview 2022* (Report, 2023) p.15 <<https://hri.global/flagship-research/death-penalty/the-death-penalty-for-drug-offences-global-overview-2022/>>.

²⁷ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2023* (Global Report, 29 May 2024) p.14 <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/7952/2024/en/>>; Harm Reduction International, *The Death Penalty for Drug Offences: Global Overview 2023* (Report, 2024) p.10 <<https://hri.global/flagship-research/death-penalty/the-death-penalty-for-drug-offences-global-overview-2023/>>.

²⁸ Amnesty International, *Death Sentences and Executions 2024* (Global Report, 8 April 2025) p.8 <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8976/2025/en/>>; Harm Reduction International, *The Death Penalty for Drug Offences: Global Overview 2024* (Report, 2025) p.11 <<https://hri.global/flagship-research/death-penalty/the-death-penalty-for-drug-offences-global-overview-2024/>>.

²⁹ United Nations, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, opened for signature 16 December 1966, 999 UNTS 171 (entered into force 23 March 1976), art 6(2) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>>; Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 36 Article 6: right to life*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/36 (3 September 2019) [10], [33] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/GC/36>>.

³⁰ Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 36 Article 6: right to life*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/36 (3 September 2019) [35] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/GC/36>>.

³¹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), 'Statement Attributable to the UNODC Spokesperson on the Use of the Death Penalty' (Press Release, 27 June 2019) <<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/press/releases/2019/June/statement-attributable-to-the-unodc-spokesperson-on-the-use-of-the-death-penalty.html>>; International Narcotics Control Board, *Report 2021*, UN Doc. E/INCB/2021/1 (10 March 2022) [212], [216], [219], [681], [769], [904] <https://unis.unvienna.org/pdf/2022/INCB/INCB_2021_Report_E.pdf>.

³² UN Chief Executives Board, *What we have learned over the last ten years: A summary of knowledge acquired and produced by the UN system on drug-related matters*, UN Doc. E/CN.7/2019/CRP.10 (13 March 2019) p.31 <[ECN72019_CRP10_V1901490.pdf](https://ecn72019_crp10_v1901490.pdf)>.

³³ Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 36 Article 6: right to life*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/36 (3 September 2019) [37] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/GC/36>>.

³⁴ Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: Call for death penalty moratorium renewed after first clemency since 1998 and third execution in three weeks' (Joint Statement, 22 August 2025) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0218/2025/en/>>.

³⁵ UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 'Experts of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination congratulate Singapore on initial report, and ask about the death penalty and about protection against discrimination for migrant workers' (Press Release, 19 November 2021) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2021/12/experts-committee-elimination-racial-discrimination-congratulate-singapore>>:

"On the issue of the administration of justice, the Committee was particularly concerned about information that racial minorities were overrepresented in the imposition of the death penalty. Between 2015 and 2020, 44 individuals had been sentenced to the death penalty for drug offences."

³⁶ UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 'UN experts deplore execution of Malaysian national in Singapore' (Press Release, 8 July 2022) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2022/07/un-experts-deplore-execution-malaysian-national-singapore>>.

³⁷ S 33B(1)(a), Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 (Singapore), as amended by s 14, Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Act 2012 (Singapore).

³⁸ Ibid ss 33B(2)(a), 33B(3)(a).

³⁹ Ibid s 33B(2)(b).

⁴⁰ Ibid s 33B(3)(b).

⁴¹ See, eg, Pannir Selvam a/l Pranthaman v Attorney-General [2022] SGCA 35 [99] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2022_SGCA_35>.

⁴² Amnesty International, *Cooperate or die: Singapore's flawed reforms to the mandatory death penalty* (Report, 11 October 2017) p.7 <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/7158/2017/en/>>.

⁴³ S 17, Misuse of Drugs Act 1973 (Singapore).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: Call for death penalty moratorium renewed after first clemency since 1998 and third execution in three weeks' (Joint Statement, 22 August 2025) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0218/2025/en/>>.

⁴⁶ UN Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 24: Issues relating to reservations made upon ratification or accession to the Covenant or the Optional Protocols thereto, or in relation to declarations under article 41 of the Covenant* (Art. 41), UN Doc. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.6 (11 November 1994) [8] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.6>>.

⁴⁷ Transformative Justice Collective, 'URGENT: Imminent execution in Singapore' (Statement, 1 August 2024) <<https://transformativejusticecollective.org/2024/08/01/urgent-imminent-execution-in-singapore/>>; Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: Authorities must end executions and stop targeting anti-death penalty activists to curb criticism' (Joint Statement, 22 August 2024) <[amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8446/2024/en/](https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8446/2024/en/)>.

⁴⁸ Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 38 <[elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38](https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38)>.

⁴⁹ Sulaiman bin Jumari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 40 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_40>; Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: Authorities must end human rights crackdown and unlawful drug related executions' (Joint Statement, 31 October 2024) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/8704/2024/en/>>.

⁵⁰ Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 38 <[elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38](https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38)>; Sulaiman bin Jumari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 40 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_40>.

⁵¹ Pannir Selvam Pranthaman v Attorney-General [2025] SGCA 7 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_7>.

⁵² Koh Wan Ting, 'Court of Appeal grants convicted drug courier stay of execution a day before it is carried out', *Channel News Asia* (online, 20 February 2025) <<https://www.channelnewsasia.com/singapore/stay-execution-drug-courier-day-death-penalty-pannir-selvam-pranthaman-4949141>>.

⁵³ Law Council of Australia, 'Letter to the Law Society of Singapore Regarding Death Penalty Case' (News, 7 March 2025) <<https://lawcouncil.au/media/news/letter-to-the-law-society-of-singapore-regarding-death-penalty-case>>.

⁵⁴ Pannir Selvam Pranthaman v Attorney-General [2025] SGCA 43 [55]-[56] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_43>.

⁵⁵ Ibid [56].

⁵⁶ Ibid [59].

⁵⁷ Ibid [62].

⁵⁸ Roslan bin Bakar v Attorney-General [2024] SGCA 51 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_51>; Masoud Rahimi bin Mehrzad v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 56 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_56>.

⁵⁹ Roshdi Bin Abdullah Altway v Public Prosecutor and another matter [2025] SGCA 16 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_16>.

⁶⁰ Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network and Ors, 'Malaysia and Singapore at a Crossroads: Stop Executions, Uphold Human Rights' (Joint Statement, 22 September 2025) <<https://adpan.org/malaysia-and-singapore-at-a-crossroads-stop-executions-uphold-human-rights/>>.

⁶¹ UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 'UN expert urges Singapore to halt planned execution of Malaysian national for drug offence, warns it would amount to arbitrary deprivation of life' (Press Release, 7 October 2025) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/10/un-expert-urges-singapore-halt-planned-execution-malaysian-national-drug>>.

⁶² Malaysian Bar, 'Malaysian Bar Urges for Intervention to Halt the Impending Execution of Pannir Selvam Pranthaman' (Press Release, 6 October 2025) <<https://www.malaysianbar.org.my/article/news/press-statements/press-statements/press-release-malaysian-bar-urges-for-intervention-to-halt-the-impending-execution-of-pannir-selvam-pranthaman>>.

⁶³ Commonwealth Lawyers Association, 'Statement on the scheduled execution of Pannir Selvam Pranthaman' (Statement, 7 October 2025) <<https://www.commonwealthlawyers.com/statement/statement-on-the-scheduled-execution-of-pannir-selvam-pranthaman/>>.

⁶⁴ Central Narcotics Bureau, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Importer' (News, 8 October 2025) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-importer>>.

⁶⁵ Adopted without a vote by the UN Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1984/50 of 25 May 1984, and endorsed by the UN General Assembly, without a vote, in resolution 39/118 of 14 December 1984.

⁶⁶ UN Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 32: Article 14 of the ICCPR: Right to equality before courts and tribunals and to a fair trial*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/32 (23 August 2007) [48] <<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/606075?v=pdf>>.

⁶⁷ Nagaenthran a/l K Dharmalingam v Public Prosecutor [2017] SGHC 222 [4] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2017_SGHC_222>.

⁶⁸ Ibid [71].

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid [64].

⁷¹ Ibid [45].

⁷² An organisation in Singapore that advocates for persons living with disabilities.

⁷³ We Who Witness, 'Call from Persons with Disabilities to Halt the Imminent Execution of Nagaenthran a/l K Dharmalingam' (Joint Statement, 6 November 2021) <<https://wewhowitness.wordpress.com/2021/11/06/joint-statement-nagaenthran/>>.

⁷⁴ Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network, 'Singapore: It's time for meaningful engagement with civil society on the death penalty' (Statement, 31 October 2022) <<https://adpan.org/2022/10/>>.

⁷⁵ Roslan Bin Baker v Public Prosecutor, Pausi Bin Jefridin v Public Prosecutor [2017] SGHC 291 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2017_SGHC_291>.

⁷⁶ Rosman bin Abdullah v Public Prosecutor [2016] SGCA 62 [47] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2016_SGCA_62>.

⁷⁷ Central Narcotics Bureau of Singapore, 'Execution of Two Convicted Drug Traffickers – 15 November 2024' (News, 15 November 2024) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-two-convicted-drug-traffickers-15-nov-2024>>; Central Narcotics Bureau of Singapore, 'Execution of a Convicted Drug Trafficker – 22 November 2024' (News, 22 November 2024) <<https://www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/execution-of-a-convicted-drug-trafficker-22Nov2024>>.

⁷⁸ Nagaenthran a/l K Dharmalingam v Attorney-General [2022] SGCA 26 [57] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2022_SGCA_26>.

⁷⁹ Roslan bin Bakar v Attorney-General [2024] SGCA 51 [27] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_51>.

⁸⁰ United Nations, *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (Human Rights Instrument, entered into force 3 May 2008) Article 12(3) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities#12>>.

⁸¹ Ss 394J(5)(a)–(b), Criminal Procedure Code 2010 (Singapore)

<[#pr394J](https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/CPC2010?ProvIds=pr394J)>.

⁸² Eugene Tan, 'An abiding commitment to the death penalty? Centrality of the rule of law in the administration of capital punishment in Singapore' (2024) 4 *Singapore Law Journal* 259-64 <<https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1034&context=sljlexicon>>.

⁸³ See, eg, Nagaenthran a/l K Dharmalingam v Attorney-General [2022] SGCA 44 [7]

<https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2022_SGCA_44>; Munshi Rasal v Enlighten Furniture Decoration Co Pte Ltd [2021] 1 SLR 1277 [17] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2021_SGCA_23>; Tang Liang Hong v Lee Kuan Yew and another and other appeals [1997] 3 SLR(R) 576 [71]; Ho Kon Kim v Lim Gek Kim Betsy and others and another appeal [2001] 3 SLR(R) 220 [58]. See, also, Syed Suhail bin Syed Zin v Public Prosecutor [2021] 2 SLR 377 [16], [18]–[19], [21].

⁸⁴ Iskandar bin Rahmat and others v Attorney-General and another [2022] SGCA 58 [20]–[23]

<https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2022_SGCA_58>; Louisa Tang, '24 death-row inmates' lawsuit against AG: Apex court rejects appeal and last-ditch stay of execution for prisoner', *Today Online* (online, 5 August 2002) <<https://www.todayonline.com/singapore/24-death-row-inmates-lawsuit-apex-court-rejects-stay-execution-appeal-1961666>>.

⁸⁵ International Commission of Jurists, 'Singapore: Halt executions and cease punitive cost orders against death-row lawyers' (Press Release, 9 August 2022) <<https://www.icj.org/singapore-halt-executions-and-cease-punitive-cost-orders-against-death-row-lawyers>>.

⁸⁶ Iskandar bin Rahmat and others v Attorney-General [2024] SGHC 122

<https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGHC_122>.

⁸⁷ Sulaiman bin Jumari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 40 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_40>.

⁸⁸ S 60G, Supreme Court of Judicature Act 1969 (Singapore), as amended by s 2, Post-appeal Applications in Capital Cases Act 2022.

⁸⁹ Ibid s 60G(7).

⁹⁰ Ibid s 60G(4).

⁹¹ Ibid s 60G(13).

⁹² Ibid s 60G(15).

⁹³ Ibid ss 60G(15)(c), 60G(15)(d).

⁹⁴ S 313(2), Criminal Procedure Code 2010 (Singapore) <[#pr313](https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/CPC2010?ProvIds=pr313)>.

⁹⁵ S 60G(15)(b), Post-Appeal Applications in Capital Cases Bill, Bill No. 34/2022 (First Reading, 7 November 2022) <<https://www.parliament.gov.sg/docs/default-source/default-document-library/post-appeal-applications-in-capital-cases-bill-34-2022.pdf>>.

⁹⁶ S 60M(1), Supreme Court of Judicature Act 1969 (Singapore), as amended by s 2, Post-appeal Applications in Capital Cases Act 2022.

⁹⁷ Moad Fadzir bin Mustaffa v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 26

<https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_26>; Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 38 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38>; Sulaiman bin Jumari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 40 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_40>; Roslan bin Bakar v Attorney-General [2024] SGCA 51 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_51>; Masoud Rahimi bin Mehrzad v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 56 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_56>; Iskandar bin Rahmat v Public Prosecutor [2025] SCGA 4 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_4>; Pannir Selvam Pranthaman v Attorney-General [2025] SGCA 7 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_7>; Roshdi Bin Abdullah Altway v Public Prosecutor and another matter [2025] SGCA 16 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_16>; Chandroo Subramaniam v

Public Prosecutor [2025] SGCA 37 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_37>; Kishor Kumar a/l Raguan v Public Prosecutor [2025] SGCA 39 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_39>.

⁹⁸ Pannir Selvam Pranthaman v Attorney-General [2025] SGCA 7 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_7>.

⁹⁹ Roshdi Bin Abdullah Altway v Public Prosecutor and another matter [2025] SGCA 16 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2025_SGCA_16>.

¹⁰⁰ Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Ministerial Statement on Singapore's National Drug Control Policy – Speech by Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law' (Parliamentary Speech, 8 May 2024) [192]-[193] <<https://www.mha.gov.sg/mediaroom/parliamentary/ministerial-statement-on-singapore-national-drug-control-policy/>>.

¹⁰¹ Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Ministerial Statement on Singapore's National Drug Control Policy – Speech by Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law' (Parliamentary Speech, 8 May 2024) [2.24pm] <<https://sprs.parl.gov.sg/search/#/sprs3topic?reportid=ministerial-statement-2440>>:

"What I was suggesting is that as we see how people file their applications, we learn. And looking at their methodology, for example, if there is a constitutional challenge – and there was last year – we may have to consider whether we need to amend the Constitution to make sure any future constitutional challenges of such a nature will not succeed."

¹⁰² Gobi a/l Avedian v Public Prosecutor [2020] SGCA 102 <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2020_SGCA_102>; Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network and Ors, 'Singapore: Solidarity with M. Ravi' (Joint Statement, 30 March 2023) <<https://adpan.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Singapore-Solidarity-with-M-Ravi-Rev.pdf>>.

¹⁰³ Ministry of Law Singapore, 'Second Reading Speech for the Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Bill, Mr Murali Pillai, Minister of State for Law' (Parliamentary Speech, 13 November 2024) <<https://www.mlaw.gov.sg/second-reading-speech-for-the-administration-of-justice-protection-amendment-bill/>>; Davina Tham, 'Law passed to clarify that baseless legal claims made with ulterior motive are in contempt of court', *Channel News Asia* (online, 13 November 2024) <<https://www.channelnewsasia.com/singapore/contempt-court-abuse-process-baseless-lawsuit-4746271>>.

¹⁰⁴ Ministry of Law Singapore, 'Second Reading Speech for the Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Bill, Mr Murali Pillai, Minister of State for Law' (Parliamentary Speech, 13 November 2024) <<https://www.mlaw.gov.sg/second-reading-speech-for-the-administration-of-justice-protection-amendment-bill/>>.

¹⁰⁵ S 3(da), Administration of Justice Protection Act 2016 (Singapore) as amended by Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Act 2024.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid s 3(db).

¹⁰⁷ Administration of Justice (Protection) (Amendment) Bill (Singapore) Bill No. 34/2024 <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Bills-Supp/34-2024/Published/20241014?DocDate=20241014>>.

¹⁰⁸ Mohammad Azwan bin Bohari v Public Prosecutor [2024] SGCA 38 [12] <https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2024_SGCA_38>.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ S 313(1)(ia), Criminal Procedure Code 2010 (Singapore) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/CPC2010?ProvIds=pr313#pr313>>.

¹¹¹ Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (Singapore, 2020 rev ed) s 14(1) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/act/cons1963?ProvIds=P14#pr14>>.

¹¹² Ibid s 14(2).

¹¹³ Ss 5, 6, 6A, Public Order Act 2009 (Singapore) <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/POA2009>>.

¹¹⁴ Ibid s 7(2)(h)(ii).

¹¹⁵ Ibid s 13(2).

¹¹⁶ Ibid s 14.

¹¹⁷ Nadine Chua, 'Activist Jolovan Wham faces 5 charges over taking part in illegal vigils for death row inmates', *The Straits Times* (online, 3 February 2025) <<https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/courts-crime/activist-jolovan-wham-handed-5-charges-for-taking-part-in-public-assemblies-without-permit?close=true>>.

¹¹⁸ CIVICUS Monitor, 'The Singapore Authorities Continues its use of Restrictive Laws to Harass Critics and Activists and Stifle Protests' (online, 20 December 2022) <<https://monitor.civicus.org/explore/singapore-authorities-continues-its-use-restrictive-laws-harass-critics-and-activists-and-stifle-protests/>>.

¹¹⁹ Suranjana Tewari, 'How a Singapore execution set off a wave of protest', *BBC News* (online, 28 May 2022) <<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-61403692>>; Syahindah Ishak, 'Organiser says over 400 pax at anti-death penalty protest at Hong Lim Part on Apr. 3, 2022', *Mothership* (online, 4 April 2022) <<https://mothership.sg/2022/04/death-penalty-protest/>>; Kirsten Han, 'Over 400 Singaporeans protest the death penalty', *We, The Citizens* (Blog Post, 9 April 2022) <<https://www.wethecitizens.net/over-400-singaporeans-protest-the-death-penalty/>>.

¹²⁰ Stephen Ortmann, 'The Anti-Death Penalty Movement in Singapore: Structural and Situational Opportunities in an Illiberal Regime' (2025) 55(4) *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 598, 604.

¹²¹ Terry Xu, 'Stay of execution granted as over 200 gather in vigil for Pannir Selvam Pranthaman' *The Online Citizen* (online, 20 February 2025) <<https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2025/02/20/stay-of-execution-granted-as-over-200-gather-in-vigil-for-pannir-selvam-pranthaman/>>.

122 S 11, Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act 2019 (Singapore) ('POFMA')
<<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/POFMA2019>>.

123 Ibid s 12.

124 Ibid s 10.

125 Ibid s 11.

126 Ibid s 12(4).

127 Ibid s 7(2)(a): Up to S\$50,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both.

128 Ibid s 7(2)(b).

129 Ibid s 16.

130 Ibid s 32(1).

131 Ibid s 36.

132 Ibid s 38.

133 Howard Lee, 'Singapore's 'fake news' fixer risks undermining public confidence', *East Asia Forum* (online, 24 October 2023) <<https://eastasiaforum.org/2023/10/24/singapores-fake-news-fixer-risks-undermining-public-confidence/>>.

134 POFMA Office, 'POFMA Action Taken Up To 30 Sep 2025' (POFMA Statistics, accessed 10 October 2025) <https://www.pofmaoffice.gov.sg/files/tabulation_of_pofma_cases_and_actions.pdf>.

135 Wing-Cheong Chan and Michael Horr, 'Debate on Singapore's Death Penalty' in Wing-Cheong Chan, Mai Sato and Michael Horr (eds), *Capital Drug Laws in Asia* (Cambridge University Press, 2025) p.87.

136 Human Rights Watch, 'Singapore: 'Fake News' Law Curtails Speech' (News Release, 13 January 2021) <<https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/01/13/singapore-fake-news-law-curtails-speech>>.

137 Stephen Ortmann, 'The Anti-Death Penalty Movement in Singapore: Structural and Situational Opportunities in an Illiberal Regime' (2025) 55(4) *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 598, 607: "...aims to consolidate information about those on death row, help those who are on death row and their families, foster understanding about the death penalty and drug control, build the abolitionist movement, and promote human rights for those in prison and especially those facing the death penalty".

138 See <https://transformativejusticecollective.org/>; Stephen Ortmann, 'The Anti-Death Penalty Movement in Singapore: Structural and Situational Opportunities in an Illiberal Regime' (2025) 55(4) *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 598–617.

139 'Anti-death penalty activist group Transformative Justice Collective handed another POFMA order', *Channel News Asia* (online, 14 December 2024) <<https://www.channelnewsasia.com/singapore/transformative-justice-collective-handed-fifth-pofma-order-4806911>>.

140 Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Issuance of Correction Directions under the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act regarding false statements of fact concerning the capital sentence that was meted out to Tangaraju S/O Suppiah' (Press Release, 19 May 2023) <<https://www.mha.gov.sg/mediaroom/press-releases/issuance-of-correction-directions-under-the-protection-from-online-falsehoods-and-manipulation-act-regarding-false-statements-of-fact-concerning-the-capital-sentence-that-was-meted-out-to-tangaraju-s-o-suppiah>>; Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Issuance of Correction Directions and Targeted Correction Direction under POFMA regarding Statements by Transformative Justice Collective concerning the Legal Processes for Prisoners Awaiting Capital Punishment and Prosecution of Drug Trafficking Charges' (Press Release, 5 October 2024) <<https://www.mha.gov.sg/mediaroom/press-releases/issuance-of-correction-directions-and-targeted-correction-direction-under-pofma-regarding-statements-by-transformative-justice-collective-concerning-the-legal-processes-for-prisoners-awaiting-capital-punishment-and-prosecution-of-drug-trafficking-charges>>.

141 Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Ministerial Statement on Singapore's National Drug Control Policy – Speech by Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law' (Parliamentary Speech, 8 May 2024) [169]-[174], [193] <<https://www.mha.gov.sg/mediaroom/parliamentary/ministerial-statement-on-singapore-national-drug-control-policy>>.

142 Ministry of Digital Development and Information, 'Operators Of Transformative Justice Collective's Online Platforms Prohibited From Receiving Financial Benefit Due To History Of Communicating Multiple Falsehoods' (Media Release, 20 December 2024) [3] <https://www.pofmaoffice.gov.sg/files/media-releases/pofma_pr_mddi_20Dec2024.pdf>.

143 Amnesty International and Ors, 'Singapore: End harassment and intimidation of the Transformative Justice Collective' (Joint Statement, 16 January 2025) <<https://www.cpj.org.au/news/joint-statement-singapore-16Jan2025>>.

144 CIVICUS Monitor, 'Singapore: Government continues its crackdown on anti-death penalty activism and other forms of expression' (online, 5 February 2025) <<https://monitor.civicus.org/explore/singapore-government-continues-its-crackdown-on-anti-death-penalty-activism-and-other-forms-of-expression>>.

145 See, eg, s 8, POFMA <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/POFMA2019?ProvIds=pr8#pr8>>.

146 Ministry of Home Affairs, 'Issuance of Correction Directions under POFMA regarding Statements by the Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network concerning the Legal Processes for Prisoners Awaiting Capital Punishment and Treatment of Anti-Death Penalty Activists' (Press Release, 9 October 2024) [21]

<https://www.pofmaoffice.gov.sg/files/media-releases/pofma_pr_mha_9oct2024.pdf>; The Online Citizen, 'Anti-Death penalty network issued POFMA order for posts on Singapore's death penalty' (online, 10 October 2024) <<https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2024/10/10/anti-death-penalty-network-issued-pofma-order-for-posts-on-singapores-death-penalty>>.

¹⁴⁷ Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 36 Article 6: right to life*, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/36 (3 September 2019) [35] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/GC/36>>.

¹⁴⁸ See Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, *Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Singapore*, UN Doc. CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/6 (6 June 2024) [18] <<https://docs.un.org/en/CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/6>>.

"The Committee recommends that the State party:

- (a) Issue a moratorium on the death penalty, halt the execution of all women on death row and consider commuting all death sentences, including those against women, into prison sentences;
- (b) Ensure a gender-responsive application of the law so that evidence of trauma, economic pressures, child marriage, domestic and gender-based violence, as well as intellectual and/or psychosocial disabilities are adequately taken into consideration in criminal and civil proceedings;
- (c) Protect women in detention, including women political prisoners and women facing the death penalty, discontinue the excessive use of solitary confinement and set up independent and confidential complaint procedures that are easily accessible for women in detention, in line with the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (the Bangkok Rules) and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 70/175 of 17 December 2015 and contained in the annex thereto;
- (d) Ensure that women have access to affordable and, if necessary, free legal aid, provide training for the judiciary and law enforcement officials on women's human rights and gender-sensitive interrogation and investigation methods at all stages, and address judicial gender bias."