

Do not circulate without permission



Singapore
Institute of Legal Education

Part A Bar Examinations 2022

Criminal Law

Subject Coordinators:

Professor Kumaralingam Amirthalingam
National University of Singapore

Mr Prem Raj Prabakaran
State Courts

LIST OF TOPICS

S/No	Topics
1A	Introduction to criminal law in Singapore
	Development of criminal law in Singapore
	Sources of criminal law in Singapore
	Structure of the Penal Code
	Interpreting the Penal Code
1B	The criminal justice system in Singapore
	The criminal justice process and its various actors
	Crime control versus due process
	Burden of proof
	Overview of sentencing
2A	Anatomy of a crime: <i>Actus Reus</i> (or the physical element)
	Voluntariness
	Illegal omissions
2B	Anatomy of a crime: <i>Mens Rea</i> (or the fault element)
	Intention
	Knowledge (and wilful blindness)
	Rashness
	Negligence
	Strict liability
2C	Anatomy of a crime: Causation and concurrence
	Causation

	Concurrence of <i>actus reus</i> and <i>mens rea</i>
3	Offences against the person (with a focus on homicide)
	Culpable homicide and murder
	Culpable homicide not amounting to murder
	Causing death by rash or negligent act
4	Inchoate liability and complicity
	Attempts
	Abetments
	Criminal conspiracy
	Common intention
5A	Introduction to criminal defences
	Denial of criminal liability
	Burden of proof
	General defences and special exceptions
5B	Criminal defences: General defences
	Mistake
	Unsoundness of mind
	Intoxication
	Private defence
5C	Criminal defences: Special exceptions to murder
	Exceeding private defence
	Diminished responsibility

	Provocation
	Sudden fight

I. READING LIST¹

1A. Introduction to criminal law in Singapore

- (a) **YMC**, Chapter 1
- (b) Andrew Phang, "Of Codes and Ideology: Some Notes on the Origins of the Major Criminal Enactments of Singapore" [1989] 31 MLR 46
- (c) Chan Wing Cheong & Andrew Phang, "*The Development of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*" in *Essays in Singapore Legal History* (Marshall Cavendish, (2005) [**SCM** p 32]
- (d) M Sornarajah, "*The Interpretation of the Penal Code*" [1991] 3 MLJ cxxix-cxlvii [**SCM** p 39]
- (e) *Ho Man Yuk v PP* [2019] 1 SLR 567 at [26]-[27] and [40]-[47]
- (f) Questions to consider
 - (i) What principles govern the interpretation of the provisions in the Penal Code?
 - (ii) What is the difference between "Explanations" and "Illustrations" in the Penal Code?

1B. The criminal justice system in Singapore

- (a) **YMC**, Chapter 2
- (b) **SCM**, Chapters 2 and 3
- (c) Keith Jieren Thirumaran. "*The Evolution of the Singapore Criminal Justice Process*" (2019) 31 SAclJ 1042

¹ Unless otherwise stated, the cases/journals/articles referred to are available on LawNet. Where possible, alternative citations to SCM are also provided (even if these materials are available on LawNet).

- (d) Chan Sek Keong, “*The criminal process – The Singapore model*” (1996) Sing L Rev 431
- (e) Chan Sek Keong, “Rethinking the Criminal Justice System of Singapore for the 21st Century” in *The Singapore Conference: Leading the Law and Lawyers into the New Millennium @ 2020* [SCM p 160]
- (f) Chan Sek Keong, “From Justice Model to Crime Control Model”, speech at the International Conference on Criminal Justice under Stress: Transnational Perspectives, Golden Jubilee Celebrations of the Indian Law Institute (24 November 2006) [SCM p 166]
- (g) **Questions to consider**
 - (i) What should the fundamental aims of a criminal justice system be?
 - (ii) How do we strike a balance between the crime control and due process models?
 - (iii) What is the Singapore criminal justice system model and is it a satisfactory model?
 - (iv) What are the components of our criminal justice system and what are their respective roles?
 - (v) What is the difference in the burden of proof in a criminal case and in a civil case?

2A. Anatomy of a crime: *Actus Reus* (or the physical element)

- (a) Section 22A, Penal Code
- (b) **YMC**, Chapter 3
- (c) **SCM**, Chapter 4
- (d) **Voluntariness**
 - (i) *Sinnasamy v PP* [1956] MLJ 36 [SCM p 212]
 - (ii) *PP v Kenneth Fook Mun Lee (No 1)* [2002] 2 MLJ 563 [SCM p 218]
 - (iii) *Abdul Razak bin Dalek v PP* [2011] 2 MLJ 237 [SCM p 220]
 - (iv) *R v Quick* [1973] 3 WLR 26 [SCM p 214]

(v) *Bratty v AG for Northern Ireland* [1963] 1 AC 386 [**SCM** p 206]

(e) **Illegal omissions**

(i) Sections 32 and 43, Penal Code

(ii) *D'Souza v Pashupati Nath Sarkar* (1968) Cri LJ 405²

(iii) *Q v Instan* [1893] 1 QB 450 [**SCM** p 239]

(iv) *R v Miller* [1983] 2 AC 161 [**SCM** p 240]

(v) *Lim Poh Eng v PP* [1999] 1 SLR(R) 428 [**SCM** p 247]

(vi) *R v Taktak* (1988) 14 NSWLR 226 [**SCM** p 251]

(vii) *DPP v Santana-Bermudez* [2003] EWHC 2908 [**SCM** p 256]

² <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1060910/> (last accessed on 7 December 2021).

(f) **Questions to consider**

- (i) What is the difference between a 'voluntary' act and an 'involuntary' act for the purpose of criminal responsibility? Does the concept of voluntariness focus on the actor's consciousness or the control exercised by the actor? What has been the approach of the Malaysian cases in assessing an actor's voluntariness?
- (ii) What are the three types of circumstances described in s 43 of the Penal Code which render omissions illegal for the purposes of criminal liability?
- (iii) Under s 43 of the Penal Code, an omission is illegal if it furnishes ground for a civil action. What are the usual situations in which the civil law (and, especially the tort of negligence) imposes a legal duty to act?

2B. Anatomy of a crime: *Mens Rea* (or the fault element)

- (a) Sections 22A; 26C-26F; and 26H, Penal Code
- (b) **YMC**, Chapter 4
- (c) **SMC**, Chapter 5
- (d) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 19)
- (e) Chan and Simester, "*Four Functions of Mens Rea*" (2011) 73 Cambridge Law Journal @ **SCM**, p 263
- (f) **Intention**
 - (i) Section 26C, Penal Code
 - (ii) *Yeo Ah Seng v PP* [1967] 1 MLJ 231 [**SCM** p 276]
 - (iii) *Jai Prakash v State (Delhi Administration)* [1991] 2 SCC 32 [**SCM** p 278]
- (g) **Knowledge (and wilful blindness)**
 - (i) Section 26D, Penal Code
 - (ii) *PP v Hla Win* [1995] 2 SLR(R) 104 [**SCM** p 281]
 - (iii) *Adili Chibuike Ejike v PP* [2019] 2 SLR 254

- (A) Rennie Whang, “*The Doctrine of Wilful Blindness in Drug Offences: Adili Chibuike Ejike v Public Prosecutor [2019] 2 SLR 254*” (2020) 32 SAclJ 305
 - (B) Reuben Ong, “The doctrine of wilful blindness and the Misuse of Drugs Act” (SLW Commentaries, 2019)
 - (C) Joshua Phang and Sarah Phang, “*Is Ignorance bliss? A critique of the requirement for “knowing possession” under the Misuse of Drugs Act*” (SLW Commentaries, 2019)
 - (iv) *Gobi a/I Avedian* [2021] 1 SLR 180
- (h) **Rashness**
- (i) Section 26E, Penal Code
 - (ii) *PP v Hue An Li* [2014] 4 SLR 661 [**SCM** p 351]
 - (iii) *Balakrishnan S v PP* [2005] 4 SLR(R) 249 [**SCM** p 342]
 - (iv) *PP v Tiyatun* [2002] 1 SLR(R) 746 [**SCM** p 340]
- (i) **Negligence**
- (i) Section 26F, Penal Code
 - (ii) *Ng Keng Yong v PP* [2004] 4 SLR(R) 89 [**SCM** p 358]
 - (iii) *Lim Poh Eng v PP* [1999] 1 SLR(R) 428 [**SCM** p 247]
- (j) **Strict liability**
- (i) Section 26H, Penal Code
 - (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 7
 - (iii) **SCM**, Chapter 6
 - (iv) *PP v Koh Peng Kiat* [2016] 1 SLR 753 at [**SCM** p 367]
 - (v) **Presumption of Mens Rea approach**
 - (A) *Sweet v Parsley* [1970] AC 132 [**SCM** p 375]
 - (B) *Lim Chin Aik v R* [1963] 1 MLJ 50 [**SCM** p 385]
 - (C) *PP v Yong Heng Yew* [1996] 3 SLR(R) 22 [**SCM** p 236]
 - (D) *PP v Teo Kwang Kiang* [1991] 2 SLR(R) 560 [**SCM** p 382]
 - (E) *Tan Cheng Kwee v PP* [2002] 2 SLR(R) 122 [**SCM** p 390]

- (F) *PP v Yue Mun Yew Gary* [2013] 1 SLR 39 [**SCM**, p 411]
- (G) *Leu Xing-Long v PP* [2014] 4 SLR 1024 [**SCM**, p 419]
- (vi) **Reasonable care/due diligence approach**
 - (A) *Tan Cheng Kwee v PP* [2002] SLR(R) 122 [**SCM** p 425]
 - (B) *Chng Wei Meng v PP* [2002] 2 SLR(R) 566 [**SCM** p 429]
 - (C) *MV Balakrishnan v PP* [1998] SGHC 169 [**SCM** p 425]
- (vii) **Chapter IV Approach**
 - (A) Sections 6, 40(2), 79, and 80, Penal Code
 - (B) *Tan Khee Wan Iris v PP* [1995] 1 SLR(R) 723 [**SCM** p 419]
- (k) **Questions to consider**
 - (i) What does the term ‘intention’ mean and how is an actor’s intention to be proved in a court of law?
 - (ii) What is ‘wilful blindness’, and what is its significance in determining knowledge? See s 26D(3) of the Penal Code.
 - (iii) Distinguish between ‘rashness’ and ‘negligence’ for purpose of criminal liability.
 - (iv) What is the degree of negligence required in criminal cases in Singapore?

2C. Anatomy of a crime: Causation and concurrence

- (a) **Causation**
 - (i) **YMC**, Chapter 5
 - (ii) **SCM**, Chapter 7
 - (iii) Explanation 2 to s 299, Penal Code
 - (iv) *R v Smith* [1959] 2 QB 35 [**SCM** p 473]
 - (v) *R v Blaue* [1975] 3 All ER 446 [**SCM** p 478]
 - (vi) *R v Jordan* (1956) 40 Cr App R 152 [**SCM** p 471]
 - (vii) *Ng Keng Yong v PP* [2004] 4 SLR(R) 89 [**SCM** p 358]
 - (viii) *Seah Lei Sie Linda v PP* [2020] 1 SLR 974

(b) **Concurrence**

- (i) **YMC**, Chapter 6
- (ii) **SCM**, Chapter 7
- (iii) Chan Wing Cheong, “*The Requirement of Concurrence of Actus Reus and Mens Rea in Homicide*” [2000] SJLS 75 (@ **SCM**, p 455)
- (iv) *Thabo Meli & Others v R* [1954] 1 WLR 228 [**SCM** p 443]
- (v) *Mohammad Radi v PP* [1994] 1 SLR(R) 406 [**SCM** p 445]
- (vi) *Shaiful Edham bin Adam v PP* [1999] 1 SLR(R) 442 [**SCM** p 447]
- (vii) *Wang Wenfeng v PP* [2012] 4 SLR 590 [**SCM** p 450]

(c) **Questions to consider**

- (i) What is the difference between factual causation and legal causation?
- (ii) When will the chain of causation be broken?
- (iii) Why must there be a concurrence of the *actus reus* and the *mens rea* for a criminal offence to be established?
- (iv) When would the principle in *Thabo Meli* be inapplicable?

3. Offences against the person (with a focus on homicide)

- (a) Sections 299 and 300, Penal Code
- (b) **YMC**, Chapters 8 and 9
- (c) **PCRC**, Section 31
- (d) *PP v Sutherson, Sujay Solomon* [2016] 1 SLR 632 [**SCM** p 733]
- (e) **Murder: ss 300(a) and 302(1), Penal Code**
 - (i) *Iskandar bin Rahmat v PP* [2017] 1 SLR 505
 - (ii) *Chan Lie Sian v PP* [2019] 2 SLR 439
 - (iii) *Tan Buck Tee v PP* [1976] MLJ 176 [**SCM** p 741]
- (f) **Murder: ss 300(b) and 302(2), Penal Code**
 - (i) *Anda & Others v State of Rajasthan* AIR [1966] SC 148 [**SCM** p 745]

- (ii) *Karu Marik v State of Bihar AIR* [2001] SC 2266 [SCM p 746]
- (iii) *PP v Khoo Kwee Hock Leslie* [2019] SGHC 215
- (g) **Murder: ss 300(c) and 302(2), Penal Code**
 - (i) *Virsa Singh v State of Punjab* [1958] AIR 465 [SCM p 748]
 - (ii) *Ike Mohamed Yasin bin Hussin v PP* [1974-1976] SLR(R) 596 [SCM p 751]
 - (iii) *PP v Lim Poh Lye* [2005] 4 SLR(R) 582 [SCM p 766]
 - (iv) *Wang Wenfeng v PP* [2012] 4 SLR 590 [SCM p 787]
 - (v) *PP v AFR* [2011] 3 SLR 653 [SCM p 774]
- (h) **Murder: ss 300(d) and 302(2), Penal Code**
 - (i) *Tan Cheng Eng William v PP* [1968-1970] SLR(R) 761 [SCM p 789]
 - (ii) *PP v Govindasamy s/o Nalliah* [2016] 3 SLR 374
- (i) **Culpable Homicide not amounting to Murder: ss 299 and 304, Penal Code**
 - (i) *PP v P Mageswaran* [2019] 1 SLR 1253
 - (ii) *Chung Kum Moey v PP* [1965-1967] SLR(R) 421 [SCM p 723]
 - (iii) *Tham Kai Yau v PP* [1977] 1 MLJ 174 [SCM p 726]
 - (iv) *State of State of Andhra Pradesh v Rayavarappu Punnayya AIR* [1977] SC 45 [SCM p 729]
 - (v) *Yeap Boon Hai v PP* [2010] 2 MLJ 433 [SCM p 736]

(j) **Causing death by rash or negligent act: s 304A, Penal Code**

(i) **Rash**

- (A) Section 26E, Penal Code
- (B) *PP v Hue An Li* [2014] 4 SLR 661 [SCM p 351]
- (C) *Balakrishnan S v PP* [2005] 4 SLR(R) 249 [SCM p 342]
- (D) *PP v Tiyatun* [2002] 1 SLR(R) 746 [SCM p 340]

(ii) **Negligence**

- (A) Section 26F, Penal Code
- (B) *Ng Keng Yong v PP* [2004] 4 SLR(R) 89 [SCM p 358]
- (C) *Lim Poh Eng v PP* [1999] 1 SLR(R) 428 [SCM p 247]

(k) **Questions to consider**

- (i) What do you understand by the words “Culpable Homicide”?
- (ii) When does “Culpable Homicide” become “Murder” under the Penal Code? Is the distinction between the two clear?
- (iii) In determining whether an accused person has committed murder under the Penal Code, must the court embark upon a subjective or an objective enquiry?
- (iv) Do you agree with *Virsa Singh* that the accused need not know that the intended injury would be sufficient “in the ordinary course of nature” to cause death? Should this not be judged, for example, in the light of the knowledge of the “ordinary man”?
- (v) Is the approach that our courts have previously taken in the interpretation of section 300(c) of the Penal Code a rational one? Has its interpretation caused uncertainty in the law?
- (vi) Have recent cases attempted to introduce a sense of rationality in the interpretation of section 300(c)?

4. Inchoate liability and complicity

(a) **Attempts**

- (i) Section 511, Penal Code (general provision)
- (ii) Sections 121, 307, 308, and 393 (specific provisions)

- (iii) **YMC**, Chapter 36
- (iv) **SCM**, Chapter 7
- (v) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 20.1)
- (vi) *Chua Kian Kok v PP* [1999] 1 SLR(R) 826 [**SCM** p 489]
- (vii) *Han Fang Guan v PP* [2020] 1 SLR 649
- (viii) **Questions to consider**
 - (A) How would you distinguish between a preparatory act, an attempt to commit an offence and the offence itself? What is the significance of this distinction?
 - (B) In what circumstances would an impossible attempt (*viz.*, an attempt to commit an offence that is unlikely to succeed) constitute an offence?

(b) **Abetments**

- (i) Section 107 and 108, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 34
- (iii) **SCM**, Chapter 12
- (iv) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 20.2)
- (v) **Abetment by instigation**
 - (A) *PP v Lim Tee Hian* [1992] 2 SLR(R) 393 [**SCM** p 820]
 - (B) *PP v Ng Ai Tiong* [2000] 1 SLR(R) 1 [**SCM** p 822]
 - (C) *Balakrishnan S v PP* [2005] 4 SLR(R) 249 [**SCM** p 825]
 - (D) *Chan Heng Kong v PP* [2012] SGCA 18 [**SCM** p 844]
 - (E) *Ali bin Mohamed Bahashwan v PP* [2018] 1 SLR 610
- (vi) **Abetment by conspiracy**
 - (A) *Er Joo Nguang v PP* [2000] 1 SLR(R) 756 [**SCM** p 828]
 - (B) *Nomura Taiji & Ors v PP* [1998] 1 SLR(R) 259 [**SCM** p 834]
 - (C) *Hwa Lai Heng Ricky v PP* [2005] SGHC 195 [**SCM** p 837]
 - (D) *Goh Kah Heng v PP* [2010] 4 SLR 258 [**SCM** p 840]

(vii) **Abetment by intentional aiding**

- (A) *Jimina Jacee v PP* [1999] 3 SLR(R) 826 [SCM p 842]
- (B) *Chan Heng Kong v PP* [2012] SGCA 18 [SCM p 844]

(c) **Criminal conspiracy**

- (i) Sections 120A and 120B, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 34
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 20.3)
- (iv) *Kannan s/o Kunjiraman v PP* [1995] 3 SLR(R) 294 [SCM p 866]
- (v) *DPP v Nock* [1998] AC 979 [SCM p 873]
- (vi) *Emperor v SG Hiremath AIR* [1940] Bom 365 [SCM p 876]
- (vii) *Quek Hock Lye v PP* [2012] 2 SLR 1012 [SCM p 868]

(d) **Common intention**

- (i) Section 34, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 35
- (iii) Chen Siyuan, "*The Final Twist in Common Intention*" [2011] 1 SJLS 237 [SCM p 950]
- (iv) *Lee Chez Kee v PP* [2008] 3 SLR(R) 447 [SCM p 888]
- (v) *Daniel Vijay s/o Katherasan and Others v PP* [2010] 4 SLR 1119 [SCM p 901]
- (vi) *Kho Jabing v PP* [2011] 3 SLR 634 [SCM p 925]
- (vii) *Muhammad Ridzuan bin Md Ali v PP* [2014] 3 SLR 721 [SCM p 934]
- (viii) *PP v Chia Kee Chen* [2018] 2 SLR 249
- (ix) *PP v Azlin bte Arujunah and Ridzuan bin Mega Abdul Raman* [2020] SGHC 168, [91]-[110]³

³ Candidates should note that this decision has been appealed against. The decision of the Court of Appeal has yet to be released.

(e) **Questions to consider**

- (i) What do the terms “instigate”, “conspire”, and “aid” mean in the context of abetment? What are the respective physical and fault elements in relation to abetment by instigation, conspiracy, and aiding?
- (ii) Can you have an abettor where there is no principal offender?
- (iii) What is the difference between a “conspiracy” under s 107 of the Penal Code and a “criminal conspiracy” under s120A of the Penal Code? Which is the easier offence to establish and why?
- (iv) What are the key elements of “common intention”?
- (v) Having regard *Lee Chez Kee* and *Daniel Vijay*, have the courts finally resolved the problems in the interpretation of the term ‘common intention’ in section 34 of the Penal Code?

5A. Introduction to criminal defences

- (a) **YMC**, Chapter 16
- (b) **SCM**, Chapter 14
- (c) Burden of proof
 - (i) Section 103, Evidence Act
 - (ii) Section 107, Evidence Act

5B. Criminal defences: General defences

- (a) **Mistake**
 - (i) Section 52 and 79, Penal Code
 - (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 17
 - (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Sections 23.1 and 23.2)
 - (iv) *Lim Chin Aik v Queen* [1963] MLJ 50 [**SCM** p 995]
 - (v) *PP v Koo Cheh Yew* [1980] 2 MLJ 235 [**SCM** p 997]
 - (vi) *Tan Khee Wan Iris v PP* [1995] 1 SLR(R) 723 [**SCM** p 999]
 - (vii) *Leu Xing-Long v PP* [2014] 4 SLR 1024 [**SCM** p 708]

- (viii) *Param Nair v PP* [2017] 2 SLR 1015
- (ix) *Chinpo Shipping Co Pte Ltd v PP* [2017] 4 SLR 983

(b) **Unsoundness of mind**

- (i) **Section 84**, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 24
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 24.1)
- (iv) *PP v Rozman bin Jusoh* [1995] 2 SLR(R) 879 [**SCM** p 1056]
- (v) *PP v Boon Yu Kai John* [2004] 3 SLR(R) 226 [**SCM** p 1060]
- (vi) *Lim Chwee Soon v PP* [1996] 3 SLR(R) 858 [**SCM** p 1062]
- (vii) *PP v Tan Kok Meng* [2020] SGHC 225, [19]-[20]

(c) **Intoxication**

- (i) **YMC**, Chapter 25
- (ii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 24.2)
- (iii) *Tan Chor Jin v PP* [2008] 4 SLR(R) 306 [**SCM** p 1068]
- (iv) *Jin Yugang v PP* [2003] SGCA 22 [**SCM** p 1065]
- (v) **Involuntary intoxication**
 - (A) Section 85(2)(a), Penal Code
- (vi) **Insane intoxication**
 - (A) Section 85(2)(b), Penal Code
- (vii) **Intoxication negating intention/knowledge**
 - (A) Section 86(2), Penal Code

(d) **Private defence**

- (i) Sections 96-106A, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 20
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 23.8)
- (iv) *Soosay v PP* [1993] 2 SLR(R) 670 [**SCM** p 1027]

- (v) *PP v Seow Khoon Kwee* [1988] 2 SLR(R) 310 [SCM p 1032]
- (vi) *Lim Chin Chong v PP* [1998] 2 SLR(R) 278 [SCM p 1034]
- (vii) *Roshdi v PP* [1994] 3 SLR(R) 1 [SCM p 1035]
- (viii) *PP v Lim Twe Jeat* [1994] 3 SLR(R) 108 [SCM p 1038]
- (ix) *Tan Chor Jin v PP* [2008] 4 SLR(R) 306 [SCM p 1040]
- (x) *Iskandar bin Rahmat v PP* [2017] 1 SLR 505 [SCM p 1046]

5C. Criminal defences: Special exceptions to murder

(a) **Exceeding private defence**

- (i) Exception 2 to s 300, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 21
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 25.2)
- (iv) See the cases cited above in relation to the general defence of private defence

(b) **Diminished responsibility**

- (i) Exception 7 to s 300, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 27
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 25.7)
- (iv) *R v Byrne* [1960] 2 QB 396 [SCM p 1085]
- (v) *G Krishnasamy Naidu v PP* [2006] 4 SLR(R) 874 [SCM p 1109]
- (vi) *Ong Pang Siew v PP* [2011] 1 SLR 606 [SCM p 1113]
- (vii) *PP v Wang Zhijian* [2012] SGHC 238; and [2014] SGCA 58 [SCM p 1123]
- (viii) *Iskandar bin Rahmat v PP* [2017] 1 SLR 505 [SCM p 1046]

(c) **Provocation**

- (i) Exception 1 to s 300, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 29
- (iii) **PCRC**, Chapter 5 (Section 25.1)

- (iv) *KM Nanavati v State of Maharashtra AIR* [1962] SC 605 [**SCM** p 1130]
- (v) *PP v Kwan Cin Cheng* [1998] 1 SLR(R) 434 [**SCM** p 1140]
- (vi) *Lim Chin Chong v PP* [1998] 2 SLR(R) 278 [**SCM** p 1146]
- (vii) *Seah Kok Meng v PP* [2001] 2 SLR(R) 24 [**SCM** p 1147]
- (viii) *PP v Sundarti Supriyanto* [2004] 4 SLR(R) 622 [**SCM** p 1150]
- (ix) *Mohamed Ali bin Johari v PP* [2008] 4 SLR(R) 1058 [**SCM** p 1158]
- (x) *Pathip Selvan s/o Sugumaran v PP* [2012] 4 SLR 453 [**SCM** p 1166]

(d) **Sudden fight**

- (i) Exception 4 to s 300, Penal Code
- (ii) **YMC**, Chapter 30
- (iii) PCRC, Chapter 5 (Section 25.4)
- (iv) *Soosay v PP* [1993] 2 SLR(R) 670 [**SCM** p 1174]
- (v) *Tan Chun Seng v PP* [2003] 2 SLR(R) 506 [**SCM** p 1178]
- (vi) *Asogan Ramesh & Others v PP* [1997] 3 SLR(R) 201 [**SCM** p 1176]
- (vii) *Tan Chee Wee v PP* [2004] 1 SLR(R) 479 [**SCM** p 1181]
- (viii) *Mohamed Kunjo v PP* [1977-1978] SLR (R) 211 [**SCM** p 1173]