

IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2017] SGHC 110

Criminal Case No. 37 of 2017

Public Prosecutor

v

Pramanik Liton

EX TEMPORE JUDGMENT

[Criminal Law] — [Offences] — [Rape]

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.

Public Prosecutor

v

Pramanik Liton

[2017] SGHC 110

High Court — Criminal Case No 37 of 2017
Choo Han Teck J
16–19 May 2017

19 May 2017

Choo Han Teck J:

1 The prosecution's case against you is that you abducted and raped the complainant on 8 February 2015 between 1.45pm and 3.37pm at a forested area off the Lornie trail in the MacRitchie Park.

2 Its primary evidence against you was the testimony of the complainant herself. She testified that you used a knife to intimidate her and gagged her mouth and nose with your hand until she passed out. You then carried her into the forested area a short distance in and when she regained consciousness you raped her twice and made her perform oral sex on you.

3 Her evidence was clear, cogent and consistent. It was amply corroborated by the forensic evidence and your statements to the police.

4 A knife that was found near the scene of the crime was tested for DNA and fingerprints. The right thumb print of your hand was found on the blade of the knife, and the complainant's DNA, possibly from her sweat when you pressed the knife against her neck, was found on its handle.

5 Your DNA and semen were detected on the three pieces of distinctive tissue papers that you used to clean yourself after the act. The tissue papers were found at the scene by the police.

6 Similarly, your DNA and semen were detected on the complainant's white top and panties. Semen also showed up in the swab taken from the complainant's mouth and vagina.

7 You admitted to the offences when questioned by the police, but of the statements adduced by the prosecution, you refused to sign one, and in court, denied your signature on the others. The Bengali interpreters seemed as surprised as anyone when told that you denied signing the statements they had interpreted back to you.

8 Against the totality of this evidence, it seemed that your only possible defence is that of consensual sex. The complainant's evidence, which I accept, is sufficient to persuade me that she had not consented. Only a credible account from you might have raised a doubt in your favour.

9 But we heard nothing near that. Your evidence was bizarre and incomprehensible. It consisted, first, of an outright denial, which against the weight of the evidence, seems to be a defence of desperation.

10 Secondly, you claim that the woman whom you accosted in the park had died. Clearly she had not or this would have been the world's first supernatural trial. I see nothing supernatural, only a traumatised woman who has convinced me that you committed the offences upon which you are being tried.

11 I therefore find you guilty as charged on the first, second, third and sixth charges and convict you accordingly.

- Sgd -
Choo Han Teck
Judge

Stella Tan and Sruthi Boppana (Attorney-General's Chambers) for
prosecution
Accused in-person.
