## Public Prosecutor v Siddharth Mujumdar [2002] SGHC 172

Case Number : CC 44/2002

Decision Date : 05 August 2002

Tribunal/Court : High Court

**Coram** : Choo Han Teck JC

Counsel Name(s): Lim Yew Jin and Eugene Lee Yee Leng [Attorney-General's Chambers] for the

prosecution; Palakrishnan SC [Palakrishnan & Partners] (briefed) for the accused

**Parties** : Public Prosecutor — Siddharth Mujumdar

## **Judgment**

## **GROUNDS OF DECISION**

- 1. The accused is a 19-year old junior college student who pleaded guilty to four charges, two of which were under s 377 of the Penal Code, Ch 224 and two under s 354A(2)(b) of the Penal Code, Ch 224. The first charge was for fellatio against an 11-year old girl. The second charge was for using criminal force to outrage the modesty of a 9-year old girl. The third charge was for fellatio against the same 9-year old girl. The fourth charge was for using criminal force to outrage the modesty of another 11-year old girl.
- 2. The accused had previously been convicted on 28 January 1999 on a long list of sexual offences as well as offences relating to theft and causing hurt. He was sentenced to three years Reformative Training. He managed to obtain his O-level certificate whilst serving this sentence. He enrolled in a well-known and prestigious junior college upon his release. He was apparently well liked and his teacher reported him as a bright and articulate student.
- 3. In mitigation, his counsel Mr. Palakrishnan SC submitted that the cause of this obviously deviant personality of the accused can be traced to his childhood experience of finding his grandmother, with whom he was very attached, stabbed to death by robbers. He was the only child of a business executive father and a doctor mother. Mr. Palakrishnan submitted that the accused was driven to put up a bold front in the face of his emotionally weak parents. There is some support in the psychiatric report of Dr Gwee Kok Peng, dated 31 March 2002, that the accused suffers from some behavioral problems that require group and individual therapy.
- 4. The offences which he had committed were serious because the victims were very young and some violence was employed in the course of the crime. These offences were also committed while he was still under supervision upon his release from the Reformative Training Centre. The present offences as well as his antecedents appear to have the mark of a serial offender's stamp over them. These circumstances warrant a long deterrent sentence against him.
- 5. It is a pity when a bright young man spends the bloom of youth behind bars; but it will be a greater tragedy if he does not correct himself because he may end up spending the rest of his useful life in jail.
- 6. Given the circumstances of the case and having regard to the submissions of Mr. Palakrishnan and DPP Lim Yew Jin, I sentenced the accused to seven years imprisonment in respect of the first charge; four years imprisonment and six strokes of the cane in respect of the second charge; seven years imprisonment in respect of the third charge; and four years imprisonment and six strokes of the cane in respect of the fourth charge.

7.	I ord	ered	that tl	he sen	tences o	f imp	risonm	ent	in resp	ect	of the	first, t	hird and	d foui	rth	char	ges	to
run	conse	cutiv	ely fro	om 21	January	200	2, and	the	e term	of i	mprisor	nment	in resp	ect c	of '	the s	eco	nd
cha	rge to	run	concu	rrently	with the	em; ı	making	a '	total c	f 18	years	impris	onment	and	а	total	of	12
stro	kes of	the o	cane.															

Sgd:

Choo Han Teck Judicial Commissioner

 ${\bf Copyright} \ @ \ {\bf Government} \ {\bf of} \ {\bf Singapore}.$