

IN THE FAMILY JUSTICE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE
[2026] SGFC 19

SSP 1440 of 2025

Between

XYP

... Applicant

And

XYQ

... Respondent

SSP 1441 of 2025

Between

XYP

... Applicant

And

XYR

... Respondent

SSP 1480 of 2025

Between

XYP

... Applicant

And

XYR

... Respondent

SSP 1479 of 2025

Between

XYP

... Applicant

And

XYQ

... Respondent

SSP 1410 of 2025

Between

XYP

... Applicant

And

XYO

... Respondent

GROUNDS OF DECISION

[Family Law — Personal Protection Order]

[Family Law — Procedure — Striking Off the Hearing List]

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.

XYP
v
XYQ

and 4 other matters

[2026] SGFC 19

Family Court — SSP 1440, 1441, 1480, 1479, 1410 of 2025
Magistrate Soh Kian Peng
26 September, 24 November, 28 November 2025

14 January 2026

Magistrate Soh Kian Peng:

1 The nature of an application for a Personal Protection Order (“PPO”) suggests that there is some urgency to the matter. At the mentions court, directions are given to ensure that such applications can go for a hearing as soon as is reasonably possible.

2 There were a total of six applications. The Mother had filed five applications against both her in-laws, as well as the Father. The Father had filed one application on behalf of the child against the Mother. The parents-in-law are represented by Mr Ramesh. Mr Jonathan Wong (“Mr Wong”) represents the Father. The Mother is self-represented.

3 I had first seen parties at the first mentions on 26 September 2025. I was told that there were ongoing divorce proceedings in Singapore. I was also

informed that there were parallel proceedings in India. Matters were in flux and parties were looking to see if a global resolution of all issues was possible. Given the circumstances, a longer adjournment of about 2 months was given.

4 At the same mentions, I had also directed the Wife, who had indicated that there were other hearings going on in India, one of which appeared to be, according to the Wife, proceedings for protection against family violence, to file an affidavit of foreign law to update and explain the status of those proceedings. I had explained to the Wife why this was necessary: so that the Singapore court would have an idea of the legal proceedings that were underway in India, and so that the relevant directions could be given if there were any overlapping proceedings.

5 At the next mentions on 24 November 2025, the Wife did not produce said affidavit. She confirmed that she could file it forthwith. She said it had been prepared, but had yet to be notarised. Given what the Wife had said, I ordered that that affidavit be filed forthwith.

6 Despite having ordered the affidavit to be filed forthwith, this was still not done. An urgent mentions was convened for the 28th of November 2025. The Wife, despite being granted the indulgence of attending the hearing over Zoom, did not appear at that mentions. She did not furnish any valid excuse for her absence. Further, Mr Ramesh and Mr Wong informed me that the Wife had also failed to appear at the hearing of her application to stay the Singapore divorce proceedings on the 25th of November 2025.

7 As is the practice when an applicant fails to attend a mentions without a valid excuse, I ordered that the Mother's five applications be struck off the hearing list. I further ordered that those applications would not be reinstated

unless she complied with orders previously given and filed that affidavit of foreign law by 3 December 2025.

8 The Wife did file a document which was purportedly her affidavit of foreign law on 1 December 2025 and sought leave for her five applications to be restored to the hearing list. It contained a single page. I read it, and it was clear that it did not comply with the directions I had previously given. That document shed no light on the status of the proceedings that were going on in India, nor did it explain the nature of those proceedings.

9 Given the Wife's non-compliance with my directions, I declined to restore the Wife's five applications to the hearing list. When directions are given, there must be compliance, or at the very least, a proper explanation if parties are unable to comply. I had given clear directions, and explained to the Wife the purpose of those directions. It was plain to me that she had not complied with them.

10 For these reasons, the Wife's five applications shall remain struck off the hearing list. Permission to reinstate was denied.

Soh Kian Peng
Magistrate

The Wife in-person and unrepresented;
Jonathan Wong (Tembusu Law LLC) for the Husband
Ramesh s/o Varathappan (Legal Minds Practice LLC) for the
Parents-in-law.
