

Response of the Singapore Government to The Guardian

1. I refer to your email titled “Media enquiry – Guardian request for comment on Lee Hsien Yang” and your intention to publish a story on Mr Lee Hsien Yang being granted political asylum in the UK.
2. We will be releasing your email as well as our response below to media at 1pm local time (in one hour) Tuesday, 22 October 2024.
3. Your proposition that Mr Lee Hsien Yang and his family are victims of “baseless” and “unfounded” persecution is itself without basis.
4. You referred to specific court and disciplinary proceedings between 2017 and 2020. I highlight the following findings from the proceedings and the relevant reference documents:
 - a. Prior to executing his last will (17 December 2013), the late Mr Lee Kuan Yew executed six wills between 20 August 2011 and 2 November 2012. Mr Lee Kuan Yew had removed the “demolition clause” regarding his house at 38 Oxley Road from the fifth and sixth drafts of his Will. It was reinserted into the last Will, prepared by Mrs Lee Suet Fern, Mr Lee Hsien Yang’s spouse.¹
 - b. Compared with the sixth draft of Mr Lee Kuan Yew’s Will executed on 2 November 2012, the last Will gave Mr Lee Hsien Yang a bigger share of Mr Lee Kuan Yew’s estate.²
 - c. The Court of Three Judges, led by the Chief Justice, found that the couple had cut off the late Lee’s own long-time lawyer in preparing the last Will, and had procured the execution of the last Will with “unseemly haste”, overnight within 16 hours.³
 - d. They found that Mrs Lee Suet Fern had “acted with complete disregard for the interests” of Mr Lee Kuan Yew, and had “blindly followed the directions of her husband, a significant beneficiary under the very Will whose execution she helped to rush through”.⁴
 - e. Both the court and an earlier Disciplinary Tribunal appointed by the Chief Justice to look into Mrs Lee Suet Fern’s professional conduct, found the couple had lied under oath.⁵ The Disciplinary Tribunal found that the couple had presented “an elaborate edifice of lies,” both on oath and in public statements.⁶
5. In view of these findings, the police commenced investigations on the couple for potential offences of giving false evidence in judicial proceedings. The police approached the couple on 9 June 2022. They left Singapore on 15 June, after confirming with the police on 13 June that they would be interviewed on 13 July. On 13 July, they did not turn up for their interview, and informed the police by email that they will not participate in the investigation.

6. There are no legal restraints on Mr Lee Hsien Yang and Mrs Lee Suet Fern returning to Singapore. They are and have always been free to return to Singapore.⁷
7. There are no legal restraints to their son, Mr Li Shengwu returning to Singapore. Mr Li was ordered to pay a fine for contempt of court in August 2020, which he has paid. He is not facing any other Police charges. The offending statement by Mr Li was similar to one that appeared in the International Herald Tribune in 1994, which was also found to have been in contempt of court. Mr Li's grandfather, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, had emphasised then that such statements must be dealt with firmly.⁸
8. As the Government has stated on many occasions, in Parliament and elsewhere, Senior Minister Lee Hsien Loong has long recused himself on all matters relating to 38 Oxley Road. He is not involved when the Cabinet discusses these matters. Nor is he consulted by any agency of the Government in any decision pertaining to members of his family.
9. The Government is taking into account Mr Lee Kuan Yew's views on 38 Oxley Road. While he preferred demolition, he was also willing to consider other options such as refurbishing and redesigning the interior.⁹
10. There is no basis to the other allegations you have conveyed.
11. Singapore's judiciary is impartial and makes decisions independently. This is why Singaporeans have a high level of trust in the judiciary.
 - a. Singapore was ranked fifth in the 2023 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, and third in the 2023 World Justice Project index for the absence of corruption in its legal and law enforcement systems. The UK was ranked 20th and 11th respectively in the two indices. The US ranked 24th and 22nd.
 - b. In Singapore, no one is above the law. Anyone, including the offspring of the founding prime minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, can be investigated and brought before the courts.
12. Singapore has a robust system to deter and tackle money laundering and other illicit financial flows, which is consistent with international standards set by the Financial Action Task Force. Singapore ranked fourth in the Global Financial Centres Index 2024, after New York, London and Hong Kong. We act firmly and decisively against those who break our laws, to preserve Singapore's integrity and our reputation as a trusted financial and business hub.
13. The assertion that the benefits of Singapore's economic growth are concentrated in the hands of PAP leaders and their allies is far from the lived experience of Singaporeans.
 - a. More than 80 percent of Singaporeans live in public housing, and the vast majority own their homes.¹⁰
 - b. Nine in 10 patients pay less than S\$500 (£290) out of pocket for a subsidised public hospital stay.¹¹

- c. Ninety percent of public education costs is subsidised.¹² According to the 2022 results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Singapore was the top-performing education system in Creative Thinking among 64 participating systems. Singapore students from lower socio-economic status homes out-performed the average student in OECD countries.¹³
- d. In the United Nations' Human Development Index 2022, Singapore was ranked first in ASEAN, and ninth overall out of 193 countries.
- e. Real wages of the 20th percentile worker have risen cumulatively by 30% over the past 10 years, faster than that of the median worker at 22%.¹⁴ The Gini coefficient has improved in the last two decades, and redistributive policies have reduced income inequality further.¹⁵

14. We have provided you with the citations for every point in our response. The legal findings are amply supported by well-documented and public findings of an independent judiciary.

15. I trust that the Guardian will consider these facts we have provided in a fair and responsible manner.

Andrea Goh (Ms)
Senior Director, Media Division
Ministry of Digital Development and Information

¹ In *Law Society v Lee Suet Fern* [2020] SGHC 255 (“C3J Judgement”), the Court of Three Judges found that the “demolition clause” was removed from the fifth and sixth will. Four days before signing the last will, Mr Lee Kuan Yew had discussed and agreed with his long-time lawyer, Ms Kwa Kim Li, that he only wanted to make two changes to his penultimate will (the Sixth Will), via a codicil. Mr Lee Kuan Yew did not discuss reinstating the demolition clause, which he had removed from his fifth and sixth will. See the following:

(1) At [5]:

“We begin by setting out some key events that preceded and are relevant to our ensuing discussion and analysis of the events surrounding the execution of the Testator’s last will. Between 20 August 2011 and 2 November 2012, the Testator executed six wills (referred to as the “First Will” to the “Sixth Will” respectively). Each of these was prepared by Ms Kwa Kim Li (“Ms Kwa”), a partner in the law firm, Lee & Lee. The wills reflected the Testator’s evolving wishes with regard to the bequest of his estate. Some of the key changes in the terms of his various wills are summarised below:

.....

(e) In the Fifth Will, which was dated 4 October 2012, Dr LWL [Lee Wei Ling] was once again granted the right to reside at the Oxley House (which had been removed in the Second Will, and which was not reinstated in the Third and Fourth Wills). However, this right was made subject to the consent of Mr LHL [Lee Hsien Loong], who was bequeathed the Oxley House as part of his one-third share of the Testator's estate, and, unlike the First Will, there was no mention that it was a right to reside at the Oxley House "free of rent". The Demolition Clause, which had featured in the first four wills, was removed.

(f) In the Sixth Will, which was dated 2 November 2012, the Testator changed the shares in which his estate would be left to his children. This will provided for a total of seven shares, with Mr LHL and Mr LHY [Lee Hsien Yang] to receive two shares each, and Dr LWL, three shares (1/7 more than her brothers). As with the Fifth Will, there was no Demolition Clause in the Sixth Will."

(2) At [11]:

"The email correspondence between Ms Kwa and the Testator [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] ceased with the Testator's 10.50pm email on 13 December 2013, which was a Friday. The Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] was not involved or copied in any of the foregoing discussions. As at 13 December 2013, which was three days before the Testator received from the Respondent a draft of what became his last will, the Testator's professed intention that had been discussed over a two-week period with his solicitor, Ms Kwa, was to execute a codicil to his Sixth Will that would: (a) revert to leaving his estate to his three children in equal shares; and (b) make provision for two carpets to be bequeathed to Mr LHY. While there had been discussions about making provision for any escalation of the value of the Oxley House in the event that it was "de-gazetted", there had been no discussions about replacing the Sixth Will with another will, nor about reinstating either the First Will as a whole or the Demolition Clause in particular.

(See also Annex A of Senior Minister Teo Chee Hean's Answer to Parliamentary Question dated 2 March 2023 ("SM Teo's PQ Answer") at pA1.)

Mrs Lee Suet Fern "did not advise [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] on the differences between the draft Last Will that she gave him, and [Mr Lee Kuan Yew's] Sixth (or Penultimate) Will. He was not advised that the draft Last Will ... [i]nserted a Demolition Clause (which was not in the Penultimate Will) – even though three days earlier, [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] was not going to have such a clause ... [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] did not alert [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] to any of these changes".

(See Disciplinary Tribunal's Grounds of Decision, *The Law Society of Singapore v Lee Suet Fern (Lim Suet Fern)* [2020] SGDT 1 ("DT GD") at [605(j)] and [605(k)].

In fact, the Court of Three Judges found that Mrs Lee Suet Fern falsely represented to Mr Lee Kuan Yew that the draft Last Will which she sent to him was the same as his First Will: (C3J Judgement at [103])

“... We also find that she was in no position to make any representation to the effect that the Draft Last Will was the same as the actual version of the First Will, given that the executed version of the First Will was never in her hands. Despite this, she did make such a representation, which was in fact false.”

(See also Annex A of SM Teo’s PQ Answer, at ppA2-3.)

² The Court of Three Judges found (see C3J Judgement, at [113]):

“... In addition to the points which we have noted at [104]–[108] above and which we reiterate here, there was a further concern stemming from the fact that the Last Will was a document under which the Respondent’s husband was, to her knowledge, a significant beneficiary. **Regardless of whether or not the Respondent specifically knew that he was going to get a larger share of the Testator’s estate under the Last Will (because it removed the extra 1/7 share granted to Dr LWL under the Sixth Will), what is inescapable is that he was a significant beneficiary.** This meant that the Respondent should not have continued to see to or assist with the preparation and execution of the Last Will without Ms Kwa’s involvement.”

³ The Court of Three Judges found (see C3J Judgement):

(1) At [150]:

“... In this case, the Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] not only failed to act with prudence, but **in fact acted with complete disregard for the interests of the Testator [Mr Lee Kuan Yew], and failed at all stages to alert him to the fact that the representations which she had made about the Draft Last Will and which he was relying on were unverified.** In those circumstances, **the Respondent’s failure to put a stop to her husband’s efforts to procure the execution of the Last Will with unseemly haste can only be described as improper and unacceptable.** To put it at its highest for the Respondent, **she blindly followed the directions of her husband, a significant beneficiary under the very will whose execution she helped to rush through.** We are amply satisfied that a reasonable person, on hearing what the Respondent had done, “would have said without hesitation that as a solicitor[,] [she] should not have [acted as she did]” (*Peter Ezekiel* ([135] *supra*) at [38]). Accordingly, we find that **the Respondent’s conduct amounted to misconduct unbecoming an advocate and solicitor,** and that Charges 1B and 2B, which are *not* premised on the existence of a solicitor-client relationship between the Respondent and the Testator, are made out.”

(2) At [111] – [114]

“**We find several aspects of this email troubling.** First, **Mr LHY [Mr Lee Hsien Yang] could not have known at that stage that the Testator [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] would agree to the exclusion of Ms Kwa, who, we reiterate, was the solicitor who had attended to all of his previous wills, and who he evidently wanted to be involved in the execution of the Last Will** (see [89(b)] above). Yet, **Mr LHY removed Ms Kwa from the**

list of addressees in this email. Second, Mr LHY said that he “[didn’t] think it [was] wise to wait till [Ms Kwa was] back” before executing the Last Will. However, it does not appear that Mr LHY had checked with anyone when Ms Kwa would be contactable or when she would be back. **In fact, the evidence shows that Ms Kwa was very much contactable and able to respond shortly after receiving the email that the Respondent sent her at 1.16pm on 17 December 2013 after the execution of the Last Will earlier that day** (see [29] above). Third, it is unclear *why* Mr LHY thought it was unwise for the Testator to wait for Ms Kwa to be back before he executed the Last Will. As to this, the Respondent testified that the Testator was in a rush to execute the Last Will because he “had a strong sense of his own mortality ... and ... was anxious to put his affairs in order”. But, this is contradicted by the objective evidence, which shows that the Testator had been perfectly content to engage in discussions with Ms Kwa between 30 November 2013 and 13 December 2013 about changing some aspects of his Sixth Will. In all of those discussions, there was no intimation that the Testator had been in any particular rush to execute a codicil to his Sixth Will to effect the changes which he had in mind.

Leaving aside Mr LHY’s conduct for the time being, the spotlight is then cast on **the Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern], who would have been aware that with the exclusion of Ms Kwa from the 7.31pm email,** the Testator was being asked to proceed with the execution of the Last Will *on the basis of the representations that she had earlier made* in her 7.08pm email (namely, that the Draft Last Will was the First Will and could be used for execution).

Despite the exclusion of Ms Kwa, the Respondent, a senior solicitor with a wealth of experience, aligned herself with her husband’s position that all that remained to be done was for the Testator to sign the Last Will before two witnesses...”

(3) At [142]-[143]:

“... As far as the Respondent knew, it was the Testator’s regular solicitor, Ms Kwa, who had the original copy of the First Will. There was thus no conceivable way for her to check the veracity of her representations without Ms Kwa’s assistance. **Yet, she acquiesced in Ms Kwa being excluded from the arrangements pertaining to the preparation and execution of the Last Will from the time of Mr LHY’s 7.31pm email on 16 December 2013 onwards....**

...

The situation changed materially after Mr LHY’s 7.31pm email to the Testator on 16 December 2013, **which was copied to the Respondent and Ms Wong, but not to Ms Kwa, who was removed from the list of addressees.** In that email, Mr LHY informed the Testator that Ms Kwa appeared to be away, and expressed his view that it was unwise for the Testator to wait for her to be back before executing the Last Will. Mr LHY also told the Testator that the Respondent could arrange for witnesses for the signing of the Last Will, and held out to the Testator that this was all that remained to be done. **At that point, the Respondent, as a senior and experienced solicitor, ought to have discerned the**

need for extreme caution, restraint and circumspection that we alluded to earlier. In our judgment, there is no doubt at all that the only proper course for the Respondent, as a solicitor, was to intervene and tell her husband that the execution of the Last Will could not be rushed through as he evidently wished..."

In addition, you may wish to note that the Disciplinary Tribunal found (see DT GD):

(1) At [607]:

"The facts expose an unsavoury tale. The Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] and Mr LHY [Mr Lee Hsien Yang], on 16 December 2013, persuaded their aged father-in-law/father, Mr Lee (then a 90-year-old man in poor health, who had recently been hospitalised for several weeks, with serious medical conditions), to sign a new Will without his usual lawyer (Ms KKL), to advise him. They cut off that lawyer (Ms KKL) from communications with Mr Lee on the Last Will, and rushed through the execution of the Last Will, in her absence. The Respondent took over as the lawyer to prepare the Last Will and advise Mr Lee, and misled Mr Lee on the terms of the Last Will that he was going to sign. Mr Lee was persuaded into signing the Last Will within 16 hours – the Respondent sent a draft of the Last Will at 7.08pm on 16 December 2013 and it was signed at 11.10am on 17 December 2013. The Will that Mr Lee signed was very different from both the Penultimate Will, and the proposed Codicil (that Mr Lee had discussed and agreed with Ms KKL, on 13 December 2013, four days before he signed the Last Will prepared by the Respondent). The Respondent gave the briefest of advice to Mr Lee, and did not alert Mr Lee to all the differences between what Mr Lee had earlier wanted and what the Last Will actually provided for."

(2) At [365]:

"Based on the evidence, it was the Respondent and Mr LHY who proceeded with the execution of the Last Will quickly, while knowing that Mr Lee would not be advised by any lawyer except the Respondent. The Respondent worked with Mr LHY to expedite the signing of the Last Will, with extreme haste, without any other lawyer advising Mr Lee. The Last Will was signed within 16 hours of the Respondent's first email to Mr Lee enclosing the draft Last Will."

(See also Annex A of SM Teo's PQ Answer, at ppA6-A11.)

⁴The Court of Three Judges found (see C3J Judgement):

(1) At [150]:

"... In this case, the Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] not only failed to act with prudence, but in fact acted with complete disregard for the interests of the Testator [Mr Lee Kuan Yew], and failed at all stages to alert him to the fact that the representations which she had made about the Draft Last Will and which he was relying on were unverified. In those circumstances, the Respondent's failure to put a stop to her

husband's efforts to procure the execution of the Last Will with unseemly haste can only be described as improper and unacceptable. To put it at its highest for the Respondent, she blindly followed the directions of her husband, a significant beneficiary under the very will whose execution she helped to rush through... Accordingly, we find that the Respondent's conduct amounted to misconduct unbecoming an advocate and solicitor..."

(2) At [153]

"... As the DT observed at [531] of its GD, the Respondent "focused primarily on what her husband wanted done", and "worked together with Mr LHY, with a singular purpose, of getting [the Testator] to execute the Last Will quickly". In the result, the checks required to ensure that the Testator achieved his wish of re-executing his First Will were simply not carried out. The Respondent's **lack of due diligence** is demonstrated most clearly by her sending the Draft Last Will to the Testator without even checking whether it was the final draft of the First Will that she had in her possession (that draft being the Version 3 Draft) ... In essence, **the Respondent simply focused on doing what Mr LHY wanted her to do without considering the Testator's interest at all.** This is reinforced by the fact that after the Last Will was executed, the Respondent asked Mr LHY, rather than the Testator, what she should do with the two original copies of it. **The Respondent's failure to have due regard to the Testator's interest is a grave failure on her part even in the absence of an implied retainer."**

(3) At [130]:

"It is clear from this short exchange that **the Testator's shift in position was initiated by Mr LHY**, and not by the Respondent or the Testator himself... [T]he better view is that the Testator [Mr Lee Kuan Yew] had been encouraged by Mr LHY [Mr Lee Hsien Yang] to sign the Last Will without waiting for Ms Kwa to be back, and **he did so believing the Respondent's [Mrs Lee Suet Fern] representation that the Draft Last Will was identical to the First Will, such that all that remained to be done was for him to sign the engrossed version of the draft before two witnesses.** The Testator could have come to this view either because **he did not imagine that the Respondent, as his daughter-in-law, would have misrepresented the position to him,** or because he considered that she had made the representation in her capacity as his lawyer for the preparation and execution of the Last Will. **On balance, we prefer the former view.....** Second, it seems to us that **the Testator proceeded as he did essentially because Mr LHY had assured him that he could proceed in that way,** and that the Respondent would assist with only the *administrative* task of finding witnesses for the execution of the Last Will. ..."

(4) At [159(a)]:

"... [T]he Testator was ultimately led by Mr LHY, with the Respondent's knowledge, to rely solely on the Respondent's crucial representations that the Draft Last Will was

the First Will and could be used for execution, **which representations turned out to be untrue.**

In addition, the Disciplinary Tribunal found (See DT GD):

(1) At [607] (above).

(2) At [609]:

“Mr Lee, who was very frail and in poor health, was misled by the very people whom he trusted: his son, Mr LHY, and daughter-in-law, the Respondent [Mrs Lee Suet Fern].”

(See also Annex A of SM Teo’s PQ Answer, at ppA6-A13.)

⁵ The Court of Three Judges found (see C3J Judgement):

(1) Mrs Lee Suet Fern lied under oath:

(a) At [101]: “...[W]e agree with and affirm the DT’s finding that Mr LHY was not telling the truth when he said that he was the one who had forwarded the Draft Last Will to the Respondent. For the same reasons, we also agree with and affirm the DT’s finding that **the Respondent’s evidence on this issue, which echoed Mr LHY’s, was similarly untrue and to be rejected.**”

(b) At [103]: “The Respondent also claimed in her AEIC that after she received the Draft Last Will from Mr LHY (an assertion which we have just found to be untrue (see [101]–[102] above)), she did not even open it before forwarding it to the Testator. This was rejected by the DT ... [W]e agree with the DT that **it is implausible and ultimately incredible** that the Respondent did not even open the Draft Last Will before forwarding it to the Testator ...”

(c) At [151]: “... [W]e note that after the disciplinary proceedings were initiated, **the Respondent adopted the position, which the DT rejected and which we too have rejected as false**, that it was her husband who had forwarded the Draft Last Will to her ...”

(d) At [159(b)]: “... **[T]he Respondent did act with a degree of dishonesty in the disciplinary proceedings, in that she sought to downplay her participation in the preparation and execution of the Last Will by giving a contrived and ultimately untrue account of her role**, in particular, as regards the circumstances which led her to send the 7.08pm email on 16 December 2013 and how she obtained the Draft Last Will attached to that email. ...”

- (2) Mr Lee Hsien Yang lied under oath: "... [W]e agree with and affirm the DT's finding that **Mr LHY was not telling the truth** when he said that he was the one who had forwarded the Draft Last Will to the Respondent." (at [101]).

The Disciplinary Tribunal likewise found that the couple had lied under oath (see DT GD):

- (1) At [617]: "In essence, an **elaborate edifice of lies** was presented, both on oath (through Mr LHY and the Respondent's Affidavits, and on the witness stand), and through their public and other statements, (which were referred to/relied upon during the Disciplinary Proceedings). **The Affidavits were contrived to present a false picture. Several of the lies were quite blatant.**"
- (2) At [588]: "Considered in totality, the Respondent's conduct was quite dishonest. **Mr LHY's and her conduct, demonstrated a calculated attempt to:**
- (a) Ensure that Mr Lee executed the Last Will as quickly as possible, without due regard for Mr Lee's wishes, and
 - (b) **Hide their wrongdoing** in having done so.
- (3) At [592]: "Having procured the Last Will through these improper means, **she and Mr LHY then fabricated a series of lies and inaccuracies, to perpetuate the falsehood that Ms KKL had been involved in the Last Will, and hide their own role in getting Mr Lee to sign the Last Will and their wrongdoings ...**"
- (4) At [610]: "Mr LHY and the Respondent tried to explain away their conduct, the contemporaneous documentary evidence and other surrounding evidence, and even their own previous statements. **Their explanations ranged from the improbable, to the patently contrived, to the downright dishonest.**"
- (5) At [618]-[619]:
- "The Respondent was a **deceitful witness**, who tailored her evidence to portray herself as an innocent victim who had been maligned. **This was a façade.** She lied to the AGC and she lied to us. **Before us, she lied or became evasive whenever she thought that it was to her benefit to lie or evade.**
- Mr LHY's conduct was **equally deceitful.** He **lied to the public, he lied to the MC, and he lied to us.** He tried to hide how he and his wife had misled his own father, Mr Lee, on the Last Will. **He had no qualms about making up evidence as he went along. We found him to be cynical about telling the truth.**"
- (6) At [233]-[234]: "They both drew distinctions between statements to the MC on the one hand, and court documents on the other and in the case of Mr LHY, he went further and made a further distinction with IPO documents. They said that different standards of care and precision apply between the two, because the former are merely in the nature of

“optional explanations”. This was said by reference to both public and private statements made by Mr LHY. **In plain language, the effect of what they said is this: Mr LHY may make untrue statements, in public and in private, whenever there is no legal penalty for telling untruths; his public and private statements cannot be relied upon to be accurate. This is a surprising statement.**

We do not find their explanations credible.”

- (7) At [491]: **“Mr LHY admitted in cross-examination that aspects of these posts “could be misleading” and “inaccurate”. These assertions are in fact untrue, and dishonest, for the reasons set out earlier ...”**
- (8) At [496]: **“Mr LHY’s explanations for the untruths in his posts were not credible. He gave the same reason that he had cited in the context of his correspondence with the MC ... – namely, that he had not written these posts “with the level of care which a legal affidavit requires”. But in fact, this was not a case of carelessness. Mr LHY knew the true facts. He admitted that some of his statements were inaccurate.”**
- (9) At [612(b)]: **“Mr LHY lied to the public about how the Last Will was drafted. He admitted to us that some of his statements were inaccurate. He said his public statements could be inaccurate because they are not sworn statements, and thus he may not look at them carefully. ...”**

(See Annex A of SM Teo’s PQ Answer, at ppA17-A20.)

⁶ See DT GD at [617]: “In essence, an **elaborate edifice of lies** was presented, both on oath (through Mr LHY and the Respondent’s Affidavits, and on the witness stand), and through their public and other statements, (which were referred to/relied upon during the Disciplinary Proceedings). **The Affidavits were contrived to present a false picture. Several of the lies were quite blatant.”**

⁷ On 11 October 2024, the Singapore Police Force issued a statement: “In response to media queries, the police confirm that there are no legal restraints to Mr Lee Hsien Yang and Mrs Lee Suet Fern returning to Singapore. They are and have always been free to return to Singapore. The police had asked both Mr Lee and Mrs Lee in June 2022 to assist in investigations by attending an interview. They had initially agreed but in the end did not turn up for the scheduled interview, left Singapore on 15 Jun 2022, and have not returned since.”

⁸ Mr Li had published a Facebook post on 15 July 2017 with the statement “Keep in mind, of course, that the Singapore government is very litigious and has a pliant court system.” In 1994, contempt proceedings were brought against Mr Christopher Lingle, the International Herald Tribune and others, for suggesting that the Singapore government relies upon “a compliant judiciary to bankrupt opposition politicians”. See https://www.agc.gov.sg/docs/default-source/newsroom-documents/media-releases/2020/in-response-to-media-queries-in-relation-to-mr-li-shengwu's-facebook-post-of-22-january-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=407377d0_2.

⁹ See Mr Lee Kuan Yew's letter to the Cabinet dated 27 December 2011, accessible at https://www.pmo.gov.sg/-/media/PMO/Newsroom/Attachments/20180402-Ministerial-Committee-Report-on-Oxley-Road/MC_Report_38_Oxley_Road_Annex_C.ashx (p9).

¹⁰ <https://www.hdb.gov.sg/about-us#:~:text=HDB%20flats%20spell%20home%20for,proud%20to%20continue%20doing%20so.>

¹¹ <https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/speech-by-mr-ong-ye-kung-minister-for-health-at-the-motion-debate-on-supporting-healthcare-10-may->

¹² <https://www.gov.sg/article/financial-support-for-singaporean-students-at-every-stage-of-education>

¹³ <https://www.moe.gov.sg/news/press-releases/20240618-singapore-students-show-high-levels-of-creative-thinking-skills-oecd-pisa-2022>

¹⁴ [https://www.mom.gov.sg/newsroom/parliament-questions-and-replies/2024/1014-written-answer-to-pq-on-wage-convergence#:~:text=1.,percentile\)%20worker%20at%2022%25.&text=2.,wage%20gap%20over%20this%20decade.](https://www.mom.gov.sg/newsroom/parliament-questions-and-replies/2024/1014-written-answer-to-pq-on-wage-convergence#:~:text=1.,percentile)%20worker%20at%2022%25.&text=2.,wage%20gap%20over%20this%20decade.)

¹⁵ <https://www.singstat.gov.sg/-/media/files/publications/households/pp-s30.ashx>

Links to reference documents

1. Written decisions of the Court of Three Judges and the Disciplinary Tribunal:

- https://www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2020_SGHC_255
- <https://lawgazette.com.sg/notices/disciplinary-tribunal-reports/dtr-feb-2020/>
- https://lawgazette.com.sg/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Lee_Suet_Fern_DT_Report-c.pdf

2. Findings of the Ministerial Committee on 38 Oxley Road:

- <https://www.pmo.gov.sg/Newsroom/ministerial-committee-report-38-oxley-road>

3. Senior Minister Teo Chee Hean's answer to a Parliamentary Question on 2 March 2023:

- <https://sprs.parl.gov.sg/search/#/sprs3topic?reportid=written-answer-13008>