

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report addresses Singapore's compliance with its human rights obligations with regard to the death penalty and related issues, including ratification of international human rights treaties, freedom of expression and assembly for human rights defenders opposing the death penalty, and the right to a fair trial. Singapore maintains the mandatory use of the death penalty for intentional killings, drug trafficking offenses unless specific circumstances apply, and for other offenses. Singapore's criminal law also authorizes the death penalty for other drug trafficking offenses and other offenses. Although Singapore has restricted the use of mandatory death penalty in certain instances, application of the death penalty has become more frequent in practice.
2. This report recommends that Singapore ratify international treaties concerning the use of the death penalty such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Second Optional Protocol, establish a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to its ultimate abolition, repeal domestic legislation that contradicts international norms concerning the rights of freedom of expression and assembly, and repeal domestic laws authorizing detention without trial.

II. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

A. 2016 Universal Periodic Review of Singapore

3. During its second-cycle Universal Periodic Review in 2016, Singapore received 28 recommendations concerning the death penalty and related issues. Singapore accepted only two of these recommendations and noted the rest.

1. *Ratify relevant human rights treaties*

Status of Implementation: Not Accepted, Not Implemented

4. Singapore received six recommendations to ratify or become a party to various international human rights treaties.¹ Five countries recommended Singapore ratify or accede to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and its Second Optional Protocol.² One country recommended ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR.³ One country recommended ratification of the Covenant against Torture.⁴ Singapore noted each of these recommendations.⁵

2. *Impose a moratorium on the death penalty or abolish the death penalty*

Status of Implementation: Not Accepted, Not Implemented

5. Singapore received five recommendations to work toward abolition of the death penalty.⁶ Singapore received 18 other recommendations to re-establish a moratorium on executions with a view to complete abolition of the death penalty⁷ and two more recommendations to establish a moratorium on the death penalty.⁸ Singapore also received two recommendations to prohibit imposition of the death penalty against persons with psycho-social and intellectual disabilities.⁹ Singapore noted each of these recommendations.¹⁰

3. *Adopt policies & legislation to promote freedom of expression and peaceful assembly*

Status of Implementation: Partially Accepted, Not Implemented

6. Singapore received two recommendations to adopt domestic legislation to promote the freedom of peaceful assembly.¹¹ Although Singapore accepted the recommendations and observed that “[t]he rights to freedom of expression, association and of peaceful assembly are guaranteed in the Constitution,”¹² Singapore has since adopted legislation such as the Public Order and Safety (Special Powers) Act which has been applied to restrict the right to peaceful assembly.¹³ In October 2019, Singapore passed the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulations Act which restricts the publication of online content.¹⁴
7. Singapore received three recommendations to review and revise domestic legislation to enhance or align the rights of freedom of expression with international standards.¹⁵ Singapore did not accept these recommendations.¹⁶

4. *Prohibit detention without trial*

Status of Implementation: Not Accepted, Not Implemented

8. Singapore received two recommendations to revise domestic legislation to prohibit the detention of persons without trial, in conformance with international law.¹⁷ Singapore noted both of those recommendations.¹⁸

B. Domestic Legal Framework

9. Singapore maintains a mandatory death penalty for a variety of offenses including piracy that endangers life,¹⁹ genocide resulting in death,²⁰ attempted murder by a person serving a life sentence,²¹ intentional killing,²² and certain drug trafficking offenses.²³ The death penalty is discretionary for a narrow class of drug trafficking offenses where the accused can show they were merely a courier and either cooperated with authorities or have a psycho-social disability.²⁴ Finally, certain offenses under the Arms Offenses Act,²⁵ the Internal Security Act,²⁶ the Kidnapping Act,²⁷ and other offenses under the Penal Code²⁸ are capital crimes.
10. Singapore’s domestic legislation, including the Internal Security Act²⁹ and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act,³⁰ authorizes detention without trial.
11. Domestic laws in Singapore authorize restrictions on public gatherings³¹ and impose a licensing requirement for online news websites.³² In October 2019, Singapore passed the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulations Act, and authorities have applied the law to persons raising allegations about unlawful methods of execution.³³ Activists³⁴ and attorneys³⁵ have also been targets of government harassment for criticizing the use of the death penalty since Singapore’s second-cycle UPR.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS

Right or area 2.1. Acceptance of international norms.

12. Singapore has not ratified the ICCPR, its Second Optional Protocol, or the Convention against Torture, among other human rights instruments.³⁶ Singapore maintains that the death penalty is necessary to “balance[] the various objectives of the criminal justice system: justice to the victim, justice to society, justice to the accused and mercy in appropriate cases.”³⁷

Right or area 12.4. Death penalty

13. In 2014, Singapore lifted a de facto moratorium on executions that had been in place since 2011 by executing two men.³⁸ In its 2016 UPR, Singapore explained that it had taken steps to eliminate the mandatory use of the death penalty and instead permits discretion “for categories of homicide where there is no intention to kill” and for specific drug trafficking offenses.³⁹
14. Singapore has taken no steps since its second-cycle UPR to legislatively limit the use of the death penalty. As discussed in paragraph 7 above, the death penalty remains mandatory for intentional killings,⁴⁰ certain drug trafficking offenses,⁴¹ and a host of other crimes.^{42, 43, 44} Authorities most frequently seek the death penalty for murder and drug trafficking offenses.
15. Further, the death penalty is discretionary for a narrow class of drug trafficking offenses⁴⁵ and for other offenses under the Penal Code.⁴⁶ For drug-related offenses, under Section 33B(2)(b) of the Misuse of Drugs Act, a person may be exempt from the mandatory death penalty only if the person has rendered “substantive assistance” to the Central Narcotics Bureau and the Public Prosecutor so certifies.⁴⁷ One legal observer has characterized this requirement as “inherently unfair and possibly onerous to the convict,” due to the high threshold for information to qualify as relevant and due to the risk that a defendant may expose family members to danger by disclosing such information.⁴⁸ Eligibility turns, in part, on the utility to the State of the information a person possesses, “a factor determined entirely by chance and the discretion of others, rather than how heinous or morally repulsive the crimes are.”⁴⁹
16. Moreover, under MDA Section 33B(4), the Public Prosecutor has full, independent, unreviewable discretion to issue the certificate of substantive assistance.⁵⁰ Legal counsel for one person who in 2019 was denied a certificate stated that “granting a non-judicial officer such as the [Public Prosecutor] the power to issue such a certificate may be ‘in breach of the principle of separation of powers,’ given that the [Public Prosecutor] is designated under the [Attorney-General’s Chambers], which falls under the executive arm of the government.”⁵¹
17. Singapore has alarmingly stepped up executions since the 2016 UPR. Since 2016, Singapore has executed 27 people.⁵² In 2018 alone, Singapore executed 13 people—the most in more than a decade.⁵³ Further, as of September 2020, there are reportedly at least 50 people on death row.⁵⁴ Approximately two-thirds of executions between 2008 and 2018 were imposed for drug trafficking offenses.⁵⁵ In May 2020, due to the COVID

pandemic, a Singaporean judge “sentenced a man to death by hanging” via Zoom video conference.⁵⁶ There are unconfirmed reports of courts pronouncing additional death sentences.⁵⁷

18. At the time of this writing, several people on death row are facing imminent executions.⁵⁸
19. A person on death row in Singapore shared information which his *pro bono* lawyer, M Ravi, conveyed to the public via social media. This information indicates that out of a total of 55 persons under sentence of death, male Malay Singaporeans make up 55% of Singapore’s death row population. People of Indian descent account for 36% of the death row population, with the majority being from Malaysia. This information, if verified, indicates that ethnic minorities, mainly convicted of drug-related offenses, may be grossly overrepresented on death row.⁵⁹
20. The Minister of Law, in an October 2020 written reply to a parliamentary question, stated that the Government of Singapore commissioned studies on the deterrent effect of the death penalty and public views on the death penalty. These studies did not measure the actual deterrent effect of the death penalty, but rather inquired about people’s beliefs about whether the death penalty is a stronger deterrent than life imprisonment. The written reply also asserted that “[v]arious surveys” have shown that “[t]here is majority public support for the death penalty.”⁶⁰

Right or area 14.3. Freedom of opinion and expression

21. Various provisions under domestic law permit restrictions on the right of free expression and assembly pursuant to broad standards that contradict international norms. Under the Administration of Justice Act, Singaporean authorities have investigated human rights lawyer M. Ravi concerning comments concerning the representation of a client subject to the death penalty.⁶¹ Further, in 2020 Singapore issued two directives under the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulations Act censoring opponents of the death penalty.⁶²

Right or area 15.1. Administration of justice & fair trial

22. In February 2018, Singapore extended for another five years the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act, which permits the Home Affairs Minister to direct the detention of persons without trial.⁶³ The statute was first enacted in 1955 as a “temporary” measure but has been extended 14 times.⁶⁴ Commentators have criticized the latest extension for also introducing amendments that restrict judicial review of detention orders.⁶⁵ Singapore’s view is that these amendments crystallize prior court decisions and that limited judicial review of detention orders are permissible in cases of “illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety.”⁶⁶
23. The Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act is most widely used against “secret societies, unlicensed moneylending, and drug trafficking syndicates.”⁶⁷ Singapore justifies the need to detain persons without trial when prosecution is not possible because of fearful witnesses.⁶⁸

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

24. This stakeholder report suggests the following recommendations for the Government of Singapore:

- Ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), its Second Optional Protocol, and the Convention against Torture.
- Impose an immediate moratorium on executions with a view to the ultimate abolition of the death penalty.
- In the meantime, amend laws to ensure that the death penalty is an available punishment only for crimes in which the person eligible to be sentenced to death committed an intentional killing.
- Eliminate the mandatory death penalty and provide the courts with full judicial discretion in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed in all cases, taking into account the facts and circumstances of the offense, as well as any mitigating considerations relating to the defendant, in deciding on an appropriate penalty.
- Amend Section 33B(2)(b) of the Misuse of Drugs Act to direct that Public Prosecutors must provide the court with a transparent explanation of whether the information provided by the accused “substantively assisted the Central Narcotics Bureau in disrupting drug trafficking activities within our outside Singapore,” and amend Section 33B(4) to make that determination subject to judicial review.
- Abolish the death penalty and replace it with a sentence that is fair, proportionate, and in compliance with international human rights standards.
- Publish timely and transparent information regarding upcoming executions.
- Cease prosecution and harassment of attorneys representing defendants in criminal proceedings and human rights defenders expressing opposition to the death penalty.
- Repeal domestic laws authorizing restrictions on freedom of expression and assembly that contradict international norms, such as the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulations Act.
- Repeal legislative authorization for use of detention without trial, such as the Internal Security Act and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act.
- Commission an independent academic study on the deterrent effect of the death penalty as compared with a sentence of life imprisonment, drawing on international best practices for conducting such studies.
- Publish comprehensive data on death sentences, the current death row population, and executions, disaggregated by nationality, race/ethnicity, crime of conviction, status of the case, and gender, to reveal whether the death penalty has a disproportionate effect on minority groups, particularly people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.11, 166.17, 166.18, 166.20, 166.24, and 166.33.

- ² Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.11, 166.17, 166.18, 166.24, and 166.33.
- ³ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 166.20.
- ⁴ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 166.33.
- ⁵ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶ 41 Singapore noted recommendations 166.11, 166.17, 166.18, 166.20, 166.24, and 166.33.
- ⁶ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.33, 166.159, 166.163, 166.167, 166.168.
- ⁷ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 166.157.
- ⁸ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.158 and 166.160.
- ⁹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.156-166.158, 166.161, 166.162, 166.164-166.166.
- ¹⁰ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶ 41 Singapore noted recommendations 166.33, 166.156-166.
- ¹¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.89 and 166.91.
- ¹² Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶ 47 Singapore supports recommendations 166.89 and 166.91.
- ¹³ Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2019: Singapore: Events of 2018* (2019). Also available online at <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/singapore>.
- ¹⁴ *Singapore: Social media companies forced to cooperate with abusive fake news law*, Amnesty International, Feb. 19, 2020, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/02/singapore-social-media-abusive-fake-news-law/>.
- ¹⁵ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.87-166.90.
- ¹⁶ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶¶ 49 and 50 Singapore notes recommendations 166.87-166.90.
- ¹⁷ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶¶ 166.173 and 166.193.
- ¹⁸ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶ 40 Singapore noted recommendations 166.173 and 166.193.
- ¹⁹ Penal Code § 130B (Singapore).
- ²⁰ Penal Code § 130E (Singapore).
- ²¹ Penal Code § 307(2) (Singapore).
- ²² Penal Code § 302(1) (Singapore).
- ²³ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 61; Misuse of Drugs Act § 33B (Singapore).
- ²⁴ Misuse of Drugs Act § 33B (Singapore).
- ²⁵ Arms Offenses Act §§ 4, 4A, 5, and 6 (Singapore).
- ²⁶ Internal Security Act § 58 (Singapore).
- ²⁷ Kidnapping Act § 3 (Singapore).
- ²⁸ Penal Code § 121 (Singapore); Penal Code § 121A (Singapore); Penal Code § 132 (Singapore); Penal Code § 194 (Singapore); Penal Code § 302(2) (Singapore); Penal Code § 305 (Singapore); Penal Code § 364 (Singapore); Penal Code § 396 (Singapore).
- ²⁹ The Internal Security Act authorizes the President to direct the detention of persons for two years, which can be extended apparently for unlimited two year periods, in order to prevent the person “from acting in any manner

prejudicial to the security of Singapore . . . or to the maintenance of public order or essential services.” Internal Security Act § 58 (Singapore).

³⁰ Section 30 the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act authorizes the Home Affairs Minister to direct the detention of persons up to 12 months when the person “has been associated with activities of a criminal nature,” and “that it is necessary that the person be detained in the interests of public safety, peace and good order.” Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act § 30 (Singapore). The President may extend the detention for up to 12 months at a time. Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act § 38 (Singapore).

³¹ Public Order Act § 5 (Singapore); Public Entertainments Act § 3 (Singapore).

³² Broadcasting Act § 8 (Singapore).

³³ *Singapore: Social media companies forced to cooperate with abusive fake news law*, Amnesty International, Feb. 19, 2020, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/02/singapore-social-media-abusive-fake-news-law/>.

³⁴ Faithin Ungku, *Singapore decried for ‘harassment’ of anti-death penalty activists*, Reuters, Sept. 8, 2017, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-singapore-activists/singapore-decried-for-harassment-of-anti-death-penalty-activists-idUSKCN1BJ165>.

³⁵ Press Statement, Lawyers for Liberty, Singapore must withdraw unprecedented threat against lawyer M Ravi for acting for Malaysian death row prisoners in ‘neck breaking’ case (Feb. 5, 2020). Also available online at <https://www.lawyersforliberty.org/2020/02/05/lfl-singapore-must-withdraw-unprecedented-threat-against-lawyer-m-ravi-for-acting-for-malaysian-death-row-prisoners-in-neck-breaking-case/>.

³⁶ U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, “UN Treaty Body Database: Singapore,” accessed June 29, 2020, https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=119&Lang=EN.

³⁷ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 103; Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore: Addendum*, (June 13, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17/Add.1, ¶¶ 49 and 50 Singapore notes recommendations 166.87-166.90.

³⁸ *Serious setback: Singapore breaks moratorium on death penalty*, International Commission of Jurists, July 18, 2014, <https://www.icj.org/serious-setback-singapore-breaks-moratorium-on-death-penalty/>.

³⁹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 103.

⁴⁰ Penal Code § 302(1) (Singapore).

⁴¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore*, (April 15, 2016), U.N. Doc. A/HRC/32/17, ¶ 61; Misuse of Drugs Act § 33B (Singapore).

⁴² Penal Code § 130B (Singapore).

⁴³ Penal Code § 130E (Singapore).

⁴⁴ Penal Code § 307(2) (Singapore).

⁴⁵ Misuse of Drugs Act § 33B (Singapore).

⁴⁶ Penal Code § 121 (Singapore); Penal Code § 121A (Singapore); Penal Code § 132 (Singapore); Penal Code § 194 (Singapore); Penal Code § 302(2) (Singapore); Penal Code § 305 (Singapore); Penal Code § 364 (Singapore); Penal Code § 396 (Singapore).

⁴⁷ u visited 8 Oct. 2020).

⁴⁸ Joshua Kow, *How Substantive is “Substantive Assistance”?*, Singapore Law Review (2013), available at <http://www.singaporelawreview.com/juris-illuminae-entries/2015/how-substantive-is-substantive-assistance> (last visited 8 Oct. 2020).

⁴⁹ Joshua Kow, *How Substantive is “Substantive Assistance”?*, Singapore Law Review (2013), available at <http://www.singaporelawreview.com/juris-illuminae-entries/2015/how-substantive-is-substantive-assistance> (last visited 8 Oct. 2020).

⁵⁰ Joshua Kow, *How Substantive is “Substantive Assistance”?*, Singapore Law Review (2013), available at <http://www.singaporelawreview.com/juris-illuminae-entries/2015/how-substantive-is-substantive-assistance> (last visited 8 Oct. 2020).

⁵¹ Danisha Hakeem, *Lawyers, NGOs and families of M'sian death row prisoners submit appeal for clemency to*

President Halimah Yacob at S'pore High Comm in KL, Online Citizen, July 26, 2019, <https://www.onlinecitizenasia.com/2019/07/26/lawyers-ngos-and-families-of-malaysian-death-row-prisoners-submit-memo-to-spore-high-comm-president-halimah-yacob-urged-to-end-death-penalty/>.

⁵² Cornell Center on the Death Penalty Worldwide, "Death Penalty Worldwide Database," accessed September 29, 2020, <https://dpw.pointjupiter.co/country-search-post.cfm?country=Singapore>.

⁵³ Cornell Center on the Death Penalty Worldwide, "Death Penalty Worldwide Database," accessed September 29, 2020, <https://dpw.pointjupiter.co/country-search-post.cfm?country=Singapore>.

⁵⁴ *Singapore: impending executions must be stopped*, International Commission of Jurists, Sept. 23, 2020, https://www.icj.org/singapore-impending-executions-must-be-stopped/?fbclid=IwAR2oiMSKcP94mAng8hSRanBkHckAnn3rA-gy01oC7KWOnzFUNErAubTC_K8; Dewey Sim & Bhavan Jaipragas, *Singapore's death penalty in the spotlight after court puts man's execution on hold*, South China Morning Post, Sept. 22, 2020, <https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/politics/article/3102582/singapores-death-penalty-spotlight-after-court-puts-mans?fbclid=IwAR3pP1FsaYM-onqPk2eUWqTmzIXFzglpMEm4gy2y2GuurD6kRge3YN8kPew>.

⁵⁵ Cornell Center on the Death Penalty Worldwide, "Death Penalty Worldwide Database," accessed September 29, 2020, <https://dpw.pointjupiter.co/country-search-post.cfm?country=Singapore>.

⁵⁶ Stephanie McLennan, *Singaporean Judge Issues Death Sentence by Zoom*, Human Rights Watch, May 27, 2020, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/05/27/singapore-judge-issues-death-sentence-zoom>.

⁵⁷ Electronic correspondence with civil society organization (Oct. 7, 2020) (on file with The Advocates for Human Rights).

⁵⁸ Lydia Lam, *Court of Appeal orders further arguments in case of drug trafficker on death row, execution on hold*, Channel News Asia, Sept. 22, 2020, <https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/drug-trafficker-death-row-syed-suhail-m-ravi-appeal-court-13134300>; Letter from Wong Woon Kwong, Deputy Public Prosecutor to Registrar of the Supreme Court of Singapore (Sept. 23, 2020), available at <https://www.facebook.com/photo?fbid=10214296602249412&set=pcb.10214296502606921>.

⁵⁹ Electronic communication with Think Centre (Oct. 8, 2020) (on file with The Advocates for Human Rights).

⁶⁰ Singapore Ministry of Home Affairs, *Written Reply to Parliamentary Question on Studies on the Deterrent Effect of a Life Sentence Relative to the Death Penalty*, by Mr. K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law, 5 Oct. 2020, available at <https://www.mha.gov.sg/newsroom/in-parliament/written-replies-to-parliamentary-questions/news/written-reply-to-pq-on-studies-on-the-deterrent-effect-of-a-life-sentence-relative-to-the-death-penalty>.

⁶¹ Press Release, International Commission of Jurists, *Singapore: the ICJ and other groups call on authorities to drop investigations under abusive contempt of court law* (March 26, 2020). Also available online at <https://www.icj.org/singapore-joint-statement-calls-on-authorities-to-drop-investigations-under-abusive-contempt-of-court-law/>.

⁶² *Singapore: Social media companies forced to cooperate with abusive fake news law*, Amnesty International, Feb. 29, 2020, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/02/singapore-social-media-abusive-fake-news-law/>.

⁶³ Kelly Ng, *Law allowing detention without trial extended, Shanmugam addresses concerns over new clause*, Today Singapore, Feb. 6, 2018, <https://www.todayonline.com/singapore/law-allowing-detention-without-trial-extended-shanmugam-addresses-concerns-over-new-clause>.

⁶⁴ *Singapore: End Detention Without Trial*, Human Rights Watch, Feb. 5, 2018, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/02/05/singapore-end-detention-without-trial>.

⁶⁵ *Singapore: End Detention Without Trial*, Human Rights Watch, Feb. 5, 2018, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/02/05/singapore-end-detention-without-trial>.

⁶⁶ Gov.sg, *5 Things to Know About the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Bill 2018* (Feb. 17, 2018). Also available online at <https://www.gov.sg/article/5-things-to-know-about-the-criminal-law-temporary-provisions-amendment-bill-2018>.

⁶⁷ Mha.gov.sg, “Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act Factsheet”. Also available online at <https://www.mha.gov.sg/docs/default-source/others/cltpa-factsheet.pdf>.

⁶⁸ Letter from Brad Adams, Human Rights Watch Asia Director, to Member of the Parliament of Singapore, “Re: Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Bill” (Jan. 31, 2018). Also available online at https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/supporting_resources/201801asia_singapore_cltpa.pdf.