FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

First Session

SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Parl. 5 of 2021

Presented to Parliament on

3 December 2021

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Members

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin)
Chairman

Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Minister for Sustainability and the Environment

Mr Desmond Lee
Minister for National Development and Minister-in-charge of Social Services Integration

Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Information and Ministry of Health

Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong

Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Minister for Culture, Community and Youth and Second Minister for Law

Mr Don Wee

Mr Zaqy Mohamad
Senior Minister of State, Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Manpower and Deputy Leader of the House

CONTENTS

SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

The Committee of Privileges constituted under Standing Order 100(7)(a) has agreed to make this Special Report under Standing Order 105(2):

1. On 1 November 2021, the Leader of the House, Ms. Indranee Rajah, made a complaint (the "**Complaint**") against Ms Raeesah Khan ("**Ms Khan**"), who was then a Member of Parliament for Sengkang GRC, for breaches of privilege suddenly arising. The complaint was made under Standing Order 100(7)(b). Mr Speaker was satisfied that the matter complained of prima facie affected the privileges of Parliament and that it had been raised at the earliest opportunity. He referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges.

2. On 26 November 2021, the Leader of the House submitted a memorandum setting out the particulars of the Complaint. Her memorandum is at **Annex A**.

Proceedings and evidence so far

3. The Committee met for the first time on 29 November 2021. Among other things, the Committee resolved to call Ms Raeesah Khan, Ms Loh Pei Ying and Mr Lim Hang Ling as witnesses.

4. The Committee heard their evidence on 2 and 3 December 2021. In the course of the proceedings, it also decided to invite Mr Yudhishthra Nathan to give evidence, and heard him on 3 December 2021.

5. A summary of the evidence given so far is set out at **Annex B**.

Publication of video recording of evidence

6. After hearing the above witnesses, the Committee resolved to make the entire video recording of their evidence available to Parliament and thereby to the public through the Parliament website.

Next steps

7. The Committee will continue to investigate the Complaint and will hear further evidence if it sees fit.

Annex A

Memorandum of Complaint by Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah against the Member for Sengkang, Ms Raeesah Khan

During the Parliament sitting on 1 November 2021, I had raised a complaint against the Member for Sengkang GRC, Ms Raeesah Khan ("**Ms Khan**") for a breach of privilege suddenly arising, under paragraph 100(7)(b) of the Standing Orders of the Parliament of Singapore (the "**Complaint**").

2. The Complaint arose following Ms Khan's Personal Explanation to the House and her subsequent clarifications thereon, during which she admitted to having lied to the House in previous sittings and being unable to substantiate a serious allegation made by her against the Police.

3. Prior to her Personal Explanation on 1 November 2021, Ms Khan had made a number of statements in Parliament, summarised below:

(a) On 3 August 2021, during the debate on the Motion titled "Empowering Women" (the "**Debate**"), Ms Khan alleged as follows:

"*In my line of work, I have accompanied people to Police stations to make reports on sexual violence. ... Three years ago, I accompanied a 25-year-old survivor to make a Police report against a rape that was committed against her. She came out crying. The Police officer had allegedly made comments about her dressing and the fact that she was drinking*" (the "**Statement**");[1]

(b) During the same Debate, the Minister of State for Home Affairs, Mr Desmond Tan, rose to seek clarifications on Ms Khan's Statement, and requested more details so that the matter could be investigated.

In response, Ms Khan stated "*[l]ike I mentioned, it was three years ago and I do not wish to re-traumatise the person that I had accompanied*", but further asserted that "*these anecdotes are not isolated*".[2]

(c) Later during the same sitting on 3 August 2021, Ms Khan rose to provide clarifications, stating that she "*raised the example because it was my experience with a survivor. The episode I raised in my speech took place three years ago and I have been unsuccessful in getting in touch with them*".[3]

---

[1] *Singapore Parliamentary Debates, Official Report* (3 August 2021), Vol. 95, Sitting No. 36.
[2] *Id.*
[3] *Id.*

At that time, I rose to remind Members of the House of the need to exercise the privileges of the House responsibly, and that they should be prepared to substantiate any assertions or allegations made by them in the House, especially those made against an agency which was not in a position to defend itself.

(d) Subsequently on 4 October 2021, the Minister for Home Affairs, Mr K Shanmugam, made a Ministerial Statement in relation to the Statement and informed the House that the Police had spent "*a lot of time searching their records*"[4] but were unable to identify a case where Ms Khan was present with the victim as alleged. He sought (through Speaker) clarifications from Ms Khan of details of the alleged incident (without naming the victim) so that the Police could investigate what had happened.

In response to a number of questions put to her by the Minister of Home Affairs through Speaker, Ms Khan confirmed that everything she had related in her Statement to Parliament on 3 August 2021 was accurate, that she did accompany such a person, and that such an incident "*did happen three years ago*". She further stated that she had "*not been successful getting in touch with the person that I accompanied*".[5] She repeatedly declined to provide any details on grounds of confidentiality.

4. At the conclusion of the Ministerial Statement on 4 October 2021, the Minister for Home Affairs stated that the "*Police will investigate this very serious matter further*", and that the "*officers in-charge and the Police will interview Ms Khan*".[6]

5. In a media statement dated 20 October 2021, the Singapore Police Force said that it had twice emailed Ms Khan to arrange for an interview as it needed her to provide details of the case, but she had not responded to the invitation and the allegation remained unsubstantiated. The Straits Times reported on the same date that in response to media queries, Ms Khan said that she would make a statement on the matter at the next Parliament sitting on 1 November 2021, subject to the Speaker's approval. A copy of the Police's media statement and the Straits Times report is enclosed.

6. On 1 November 2021, Ms Khan delivered her Personal Explanation to Parliament. In it, she stated "*I was not present with the survivor in the Police station as I described*",[7] and that the anecdote she described in Parliament had in fact been allegedly told to her by a survivor in a support group for women, of which Ms Khan was a member.

---

[4] *Singapore Parliamentary Debates, Official Report* (4 October 2021), Vol. 95, Sitting No. 39.
[5] *Id.*
[6] *Id.*
[7] *Singapore Parliamentary Debates, Official Report* (1 November 2021), Vol. 95, Sitting No. 41.

7. In her clarifications following the Personal Explanation, Ms Khan further admitted that:

(a) what she had said in her Statement about accompanying the survivor to the Police station and what she allegedly saw on that occasion were untrue;

(b) her clarification on 3 August 2021 to the Minister of State for Home Affairs, claiming she "*had accompanied*"[8] the survivor to the Police station, was untrue;

(c) her affirmative response on 4 October 2021 to the Minister for Home Affairs' request for confirmation that "*everything she told us is accurate, that she did accompany such a person and such an incident did happen*",[9] was untrue;

(d) whilst she had, on 4 October 2021, cited confidentiality as her reason for refusing to provide further details of the incident to the House, she did not in fact have any details of the allegation she had made against the Police.

8. In her Personal Explanation, the reason put forward by Ms Khan for relating an untruthful story to Parliament was because she wanted to share the survivor's account but did not wish to disclose that she was part of a support group for women. During her clarifications, Ms Khan suggested that she had made a mistake "*in my haste and in my passion to advocate for survivors like myself*".[10] However, she admitted that it would have been possible to tell the survivor's story without having to state the untruths and without having to refer to the survivors' group.

9. In response to my query as to why Ms Khan repeated the untruths in Parliament on 4 October 2021, two months after the original Statement (during which there would have been time to reflect) and despite my caution to Members of the need to exercise the privileges of the House responsibly and to be prepared to substantiate allegations made in Parliament, Ms Khan stated that she "*really wanted to protect the identity of the survivor and the survivors in the women's support group*", that she was "*not ready at that point to come forward with this information*", and that "*after being able to have discussions with my family, with my friends, and also informing the relevant people, it was it was* [sic] *clear that I wanted to make this apology; I wanted to make this personal explanation like I have done so today.*"[11]

---

[8] *Id.*
[9] *Id.*
[10] *Id.*
[11] *Id.*

10. Ms Khan has therefore admitted to lying to Parliament several times and being unable to substantiate the allegation that she had made against the Police in Parliament on 3 August 2021. These are matters which affect the privileges of Parliament.

11. Given the circumstances, I moved to refer the Complaint before the Committee of Privileges with respect to:

(a) the various untruths made by Ms Khan in Parliament referred to above, including her explanations for those untruths and responses to the clarifications sought by me in Parliament on 1 November 2021; and

(b) Ms Khan's failure to substantiate the allegation she made in Parliament on 3 August 2021,

for whatever findings it deems fit and proper to recommend in the matter.

Indranee Rajah
Leader of the House

26 November 2021

POLICE STATEMENT

On 3 August 2021, Member of Parliament Ms Raeesah Khan said in Parliament that three years ago, she had accompanied a 25-year-old rape victim (lady) to make a police report. Ms Khan said that the victim had come out crying, because the Police officer had allegedly made comments about her dressing and the fact that she had been drinking.

The Police have made an extensive search, to look for the case. We could not identify such a case or the officers allegedly involved as stated by Ms Khan in Parliament.

On 4 October 2021, Minister for Home Affairs K Shanmugam asked Ms Khan in Parliament to provide more information to assist the Police on the case, such as the police station, the month the report was filed and other details. Ms Khan declined to provide any details, citing confidentiality. The Minister said that the Police will ask Ms Khan to come for an interview.

The Serious Sexual Crime Branch of the Criminal Investigation Department, which investigates into rape offences, sent an email to Ms Khan on 7 October 2021, requesting her to get in touch with the Police by 14 October 2021, to arrange for an interview. The Police needed her to provide details on the case. She was assured that the Police would do everything possible to safeguard the victim's identity from public disclosure. A reminder email was sent to Ms Khan on 15 October 2021, to get in touch with the Police by 18 October 2021.

The Police have still not heard from Ms Khan.

Ms Khan has so far not substantiated her allegations against Police officers with further details on the case.

As stated above, the extensive search done by the Police has not shown up any incident as described by Ms Khan, and we cannot confirm that such an incident actually took place.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
SINGAPORE POLICE FORCE
20 October 2021 @ 2:00 PM

THE STRAITS TIMES

Alleged mishandling of sexual assault case: No response from WP MP Raeesah, say police

Police said MP Raeesah Khan has not responded to requests to provide more details on the case she raised in Parliament in August.

Rei Kurohi

UPDATED OCT 20, 2021, 7:36 PM

SINGAPORE - The police on Wednesday (Oct 20) said it has not managed to identify a case of sexual assault that Workers' Party (WP) MP Raeesah Khan had alleged was mishandled, following an extensive search.

"We cannot confirm that such an incident actually took place," the police said in a statement, adding that Ms Raeesah has not responded to requests to provide more details on the case she raised in Parliament in August.

In response to queries from The Straits Times, Ms Raeesah said: "As the issue relates to a speech I made in Parliament, I will make a statement on the matter at the next sitting of Parliament on Nov 1, subject to the Speaker's approval."

The Serious Sexual Crime Branch of the Criminal Investigation Department, which investigates rape offences, had sent an e-mail to Ms Raeesah on Oct 7 asking her to contact the police and arrange an interview by Oct 14.

"The police needed her to provide details on the case. She was assured that the police would do everything possible to safeguard the victim's identity from public disclosure," the police said.

Another e-mail was sent to Ms Raeesah last Friday (Oct 15), asking her to reply by Monday (Oct 18).

The police said it has not heard from Ms Raeesah, who "has so far not substantiated her allegations against police officers with further details on the case".

In a speech during a debate on empowering women on Aug 3, Ms Raeesah had told the House that she accompanied a 25-year-old rape victim to a police station to make a report three years ago.

She said the police officer who interviewed the victim had allegedly made inappropriate comments about her dressing and the fact that she has been drinking.

On Oct 4, Home Affairs and Law Minister K. Shanmugam asked Ms Raeesah in Parliament to provide more details, such as the rough date of the incident, which police station she had accompanied the victim to, about the police officers involved, and whether she had highlighted the incident to the police or filed a complaint.

The minister said the police had checked their records and found no cases that fit Ms Raeesah's description.

In response, Ms Raeesah affirmed that her account was true but repeatedly declined to reveal any further details, citing confidentiality concerns.

Mr Shanmugam then said the police would interview Ms Raeesah and continue to investigate the case.

Annex B

Summary of key points of evidence of Ms Raeesah Khan, Ms Loh Pei Ying, Mr Lim Hang Ling and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan

(B1) Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Ms Raeesah Khan on 2 and 3 Dec 2021

1. Ms Raeesah Khan ("Ms Khan") gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges ("COP") on 2 and 3 Dec 2021.

2. The key points from Ms Khan's evidence are summarised below.

I. Ms Khan's statement on 3 Aug 2021

3. Ms Khan told the COP that she had lied to Parliament on 3 Aug 2021, when she said as follows: that she had accompanied a sexual assault survivor to the Police station; and that the survivor had told her after leaving the station, that the Police had made inappropriate comments about her attire, and the fact that she had been drinking.

4. The truth was that :

    a. Ms Khan had not, in fact, accompanied the survivor she was referring to a police station to make a report. The description of the incident was untrue.

    b. She lied because she wanted her anecdote, which she had heard at a sexual assault survivor support group, to be more credible.

II. Ms Khan's discussion with the Workers' Party Leadership

5. After Ms Khan delivered her speech in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021, WP Sec-Gen Mr Pritam Singh asked her about the anecdote she cited in Parliament. On 7 Aug 2021, Ms Khan spoke with Mr Pritam Singh, and informed him that her statement in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 was untrue. On 8 Aug 2021, Ms Khan met with Mr Pritam Singh, WP Chairman Ms Sylvia Lim and WP Vice-Chairman Mr Faisal Manap. At the meeting, Ms Khan told them that she had lied in Parliament on 3 Aug, and that she had no way of substantiating the statements she had made.

    a. As they (Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap) were more seasoned politicians, Ms Khan confessed to them that she had lied, and sought their guidance.

    b. They (Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap) told her that:

        i. The best thing for her to do would be to continue with the narrative that she had already given in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 (i.e. keep to the lie).

        ii. If Ms Khan and the WP could get away with it, there was no need to clarify the lie. If the matter was brought up again, there would also be no need for her to clarify and there was no need for the truth to be told.

6. Ms Khan also contemporaneously (on 8 Aug) told Ms Loh Pei Ying ("Ms Loh"), her secretarial assistant, and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan ("Mr Nathan"), a volunteer with WP, what had transpired at her meeting with Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap. On 8 Aug, she messaged the following to them:

> "Hey guys, I just met pritam, Sylvia and Faisal. And we spoke about the Muslim issue and the police accusation. I told them what I told you guys, and they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening."

7. The message referred to two issues, which Ms Khan had spoken about in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 – (1) certain Muslim issues affecting women, and (2) her (untrue) anecdote about the sexual assault case and allegation against the Police. The reference to a "statement" in the last line of the message refers to the Muslim issues. (On 8 Aug, Ms Khan followed-up on this by putting out on FB the "statement" on the Muslim issues that her message referred to.) The reference to taking the "information to the grave" was that Ms Khan should continue to lie about the sexual assault case and allegation against the Police – the untruths referred to at Para 3 above.

8. On 3 Oct 2021 (the day before the Parliament sitting of 4 Oct 2021), Mr Pritam Singh visited Ms Khan at her home. Mr Pritam Singh told her that if she kept to her existing narrative on the untruths which she had said on 3 Aug, there would be no judgement by him (Mr Pritam Singh).

    a. Ms Khan understood, from what Mr Pritam Singh said, that Mr Pritam Singh was advising her to continue to lie, should the matter come up the next day (4 Oct) during the Parliamentary session.

9. Mr Pritam Singh did not ask Ms Khan to clarify and state the truth in Parliament.

    a. As of 4 Oct 2021, no one from the WP had told Ms Khan that she should clarify and tell the truth to Parliament on this matter. To the contrary, Ms Khan was advised that she can continue to lie.

10. On 4 Oct 2021, Ms Khan was questioned by the Minister for Home Affairs in Parliament. She was asked if the incident that she had recounted in Parliament on 3 Aug had in fact taken place, Ms Khan maintained her lie and said that what she had said on 3 Aug was true, and that the incident had taken place as described by her.

11. On 4 Oct, after she had lied again (Para 9 above), about the sexual assault case, Ms Khan met with Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim. They met at Mr Pritam Singh's office in Parliament (given to the Leader of the Opposition). They discussed the next steps, including about a possible Committee of Privileges which might be set up to look at Ms Khan's conduct. Neither Mr Pritam Singh nor Ms Sylvia Lim asked Ms Khan why she had lied again earlier, in answering questions asked by the Minister for Home Affairs. Nor did they suggest that Ms Khan clarify the truth in Parliament.

12. Ms Khan then received an email from the Police dated 7 Oct, inviting her to assist them in investigating the matters she had raised on 3 Aug in Parliament. Ms Khan sought advice from

Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim when she received this email. They directed her not to respond to the Police and to ignore the requests, as the Police could not compel Ms Khan to speak with the Police. Ms Khan's concern was that if she had gone to the police, giving a statement, without any privileges, as opposed to making a clarification in Parliament, where she would have privileges.

13. On 12 Oct, Ms Khan went to a meeting called by Mr Pritam Singh. Ms Khan met with Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim. By then, Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim came to the view that the matter would not be dropped, and was not going to go away. The three of them discussed together, and decided that Ms Khan should come clean and tell the truth. At this meeting, Ms Khan asked, if disciplinary action will be taken against her and the answer given to her was no.

14. On 1 Nov 2021, Ms Khan made a personal explanation in Parliament, clarifying that she had lied on 3 Aug and 4 Oct.

15. Ms Khan said that she was shocked and surprised to learn that the WP had formed a Disciplinary Panel ("DP") on 2 Nov to look into her lies to Parliament.

16. She attended before the DP on 8 Nov 2021, to explain why she had lied repeatedly to Parliament. Ms Khan subsequently requested to meet the DP again, this time on 29 Nov 2021, to talk about her performance as an MP. At that meeting, it was suggested to her by Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim that she should resign as a member of the WP. It was suggested to her that this was for her wellbeing and because she no longer had the support of fellow Sengkang GRC MPs.

17. Ms Khan decided to tender her resignation from WP as she acknowledged that she had made a mistake.

18. When asked by the COP, Ms Khan said that:

    a. If the WP leadership had told her to come clean to Parliament in Oct 2021, or to assist the Police in their enquiries and tell them the truth, she would have done so.

    b. She had done neither because they had told Ms Khan that there would be no judgement if she did not clarify the truth in Parliament. She took that to mean that she should continue to lie. She had also been told not to respond to the Police. She had also been told in early Aug, by Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap (Para 5.b above) that she should keep to the lie, and there was no need for her to tell the truth.

    c. No senior WP leader or activist had told her to come clean to Parliament on 4 Oct.

19. COP asked Ms Khan about the contents of the press conference held by the WP at midday on 2 Dec 2021:

    a. During the WP press conference, Mr Pritam Singh had said that there had been an order to Ms Khan to clarify the truth in Parliament in Oct, but she had acted contrary to that.

i. Ms Khan disagreed with this – there was no order for her to clarify the facts in Oct.

ii. No one from WP advised her to tell the truth.

iii. On the contrary, she had been advised by Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap, on 8 August, to continue her false narrative. And had been told on 3 October (by Mr Pritam Singh) that there would be no judgement if she continued with her lie.

b. During the WP press conference, Mr Pritam Singh said that the DP had put to Ms Khan that if she did not resign on her own accord, she would be expelled from WP.

i. Ms Khan said that this was not said to her.

ii. When she met the DP on 29 Nov, it was suggested to her that she should resign, as it was for her wellbeing and because she had lost the support of her Sengkang GRC MPs.

(B2) Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Ms Loh Pei Ying on 2 Dec 2021

[Ms Loh was secretarial assistant to Mr Pritam Singh from Mar 2013 to Jan 2016,
and to Ms Raeesah Khan from Jul 2020 until Ms Khan's resignation]

1. Ms Loh Pei Ying ("Ms Loh") gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges ("COP") on 2 Dec 2021.

2. The key points from Ms Loh's evidence are summarised below.

I. Ms Raeesah Khan's ("Ms Khan") statement on 3 Aug 2021

3. On 7 Aug 2021, Ms Khan told Ms Loh and Mr Yudhishthra Nathan ("Mr Nathan") that:

    a. What she (Ms Khan) had said in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 was untrue in parts.

    b. She was also unable to substantiate what she had said.

    c. Ms Khan had not, (contrary to what she told Parliament on 3 Aug), accompanied a victim to a Police Station.

II. Ms Khan's discussions with the Workers' Party ("WP") Leadership

4. Earlier that day (on 7 Aug 2021), Ms Khan had told the truth to Mr Pritam Singh – namely that the anecdote that Ms Khan gave on 3 Aug 2021 to Parliament was untrue.

5. On 8 Aug2021, Ms Khan met with Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap. She told them that what she had said in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 was untrue.

6. Later that day, Ms Khan reported to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, on 8 Aug 2021, what Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap told Ms Khan, in response, after she told them that she had told an untruth in Parliament. They told Ms Khan "to take the information to the grave". The Whatsapp Message to her Chat Group with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan is as follows:

> "Raeesah WP
> Hey guys. I just met with pritam, Sylvia and Faisal. And we spoke about the Muslim issues and the police accusation. I told them what I told you guys, and they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening."

7. When Ms Khan lied again on 4 Oct 2021, in Parliament, Ms Loh was shocked and scared for Ms Khan.

8. On 12 Oct 2021, Ms Khan told Ms Loh that she was going to make a statement in Parliament about the true position concerning her statement of 3 Aug 2021. Ms Loh then requested to meet with Mr Pritam Singh, to discuss what Ms Khan should say in Parliament, and how she should convey the truth. Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met with Mr Pritam Singh later that evening (on 12 Oct 2021).

9. At this meeting, Mr Pritam Singh told Ms Loh and Mr Nathan that he had met with Ms Khan on 3 Oct 2021 (the day before the 4 Oct Parliament sitting, when Ms Khan lied again). Mr Pritam Singh said that he had told Ms Khan:

    a. He had a feeling Ms Khan's statement (made on 3 Aug 2021) might come up in Parliament again. And Ms Khan might be probed about this issue.

    b. Mr Pritam Singh told Ms Khan that he will not judge Ms Khan.

    c. In saying this, on 3 Oct 2021, Mr Pritam Singh had left the choice to Ms Khan, as to whether she should tell the truth about her 3 Aug 2021 statement, if she was asked about it in Parliament on 4 Oct 2021. Ms Loh was disappointed that Mr Pritam Singh had said this to Ms Khan.

10. Ms Loh was not fully happy with the WP statement of 1 Nov 2021, because it did not reveal Mr Pritam Singh's knowledge of the matter.

    a. Ms Loh felt that the involvement of Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap had been intentionally omitted.

    b. The omission was quite stark.

11. Ms Loh and Mr Nathan were surprised when the WP set up a Disciplinary Panel ("DP") on 2 Nov 2021.

    a. Ms Loh thought the composition of the DP was self-serving.

    b. Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap were the very people (a) who had known that what Ms Khan had said was untrue (b) and they were the only members of the DP.

    c. The correct thing to do was to disclose in the WP Statement that the DP had intimate knowledge of the falsehood from an early stage.

    d. Ms Khan would be entitled to say she went to them, the very people now judging her, she went to them for counselling, guidance and advice.

12. On 25 Nov 2021, Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met the DP of the WP. Ms Loh told them:

    a. The DP should tell the public the true events that took place.

    b. Not disclosing the true events would be highly unfair to Ms Khan.

    Mr Nathan attended the meeting with the WP DP jointly with Ms Loh and made joint submission which both agreed.

13. Ms Loh said to Mr Pritam Singh, at this meeting with the DP that Mr Pritam Singh should tell the public the truth, or at least relay a timeline of the events, because it shows his involvement in what had happened.

14. Ms Loh told the WP DP that they should tell the public the truth. In response, the DP just nodded and took notes.

15. Ms Khan may have felt betrayed by what has happened.

16. Ms Khan is not the sole actor in how things transpired. When Ms Khan felt the need to come clean, she had informed the WP leadership (Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap) of the matter. They knew. Thus it was not fair to Ms Khan, that in public, all the blame is put on her by the WP.

17. Ms Loh said that several parts of the statement made by Mr Pritam Singh, to the media, on 2 Dec 2021 were not true.

18. In closing, Ms Loh testified that it pained her to have to say all this about the Workers' Party. She had no agenda, and had been a member of the Workers' Party for 10 years and gave the cause a reasonable amount of her personal time and youth. She appreciated the ramifications of what she shared but to her, beyond anything else, she felt that it is important to be truthful to the country. Ms Loh was tearing as she said this.

(B3) Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Mr Lim Hang Ling on 2 Dec 2021

1. Mr Lim Hang Ling ("Mr Lim"), also known as Mr Mike Lim, gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges ("COP") on 2 Dec 2021.

2. The key points from Mr Lim's evidence are summarised below.

3. Mr Lim told the COP that he was a member of the Workers' Party ("WP"), and had served as Ms Raeesah Khan's ("Ms Khan") Legislative Assistant ("LA") since Nov 2020, while she had been a Member of Parliament ("MP").

    a. He clarified that as Ms Khan's LA, he did not help Ms Khan with Parliamentary matters, such as drafting speeches and Parliamentary Questions, but only with grassroots activities, such as arranging for house visits, festive events, and estate works.

4. Mr Lim said that he did not know in advance about the statements that Ms Khan delivered in Parliament on 3 Aug and 4 Oct 2021, where she falsely claimed that she had accompanied a sexual assault survivor to the police station, and that the police had made inappropriate comments to the survivor. Mr Lim only found out about these statements through media reports, and was not familiar with the details.

    a. He was also not aware that the police had approached Ms Khan to assist them with the allegations that she had made against the police in Parliament.

    b. When residents asked about the issues raised in Ms Khan's statements in Parliament, for instance during estate walks and house visits, Ms Khan would address them directly, and Mr Lim was not involved in the answers.

5. Mr Lim had not discussed Ms Khan's statements and allegations with other Workers' Party members, prior to Ms Khan's admission in Parliament on 1 Nov 2021 that she had lied in her Parliamentary statements on 3 Aug and 4 Oct 2021.

6. On the day before Ms Khan's statement in Parliament on 1 Nov 2021, Ms Khan shared a draft of her planned statement with Mr Lim, who gave some suggestions on the wording and language but not the substantive points made.

7. Mr Lim was not surprised that WP formed a Disciplinary Panel ("DP") on 2 Nov 2021 to look into Ms Khan's conduct. He had looked forward to the DP uncovering the truth of the matter, and he trusted in the DP to be impartial.

8. On 30 Nov 2021, the day of Ms Khan's resignation from WP and as an MP, she informed Mr Lim that she was going to resign before she did so.

    a. Prior to that, Mr Lim and Ms Khan had discussed the possibility that things might evolve to a stage when Ms Khan had to consider resigning, but Mr Lim did not give Ms Khan any suggestions on whether she should make this decision. Mr Lim did not know from these discussions whether or when Ms Khan intended to resign.

(B4) Summary of Key Points from Evidence Given by Mr Yudhishthra Nathan on 3 Dec 2021

1. Mr Yudhishthra Nathan ("Mr Nathan") gave evidence to the Committee of Privileges ("COP") on 3 Dec 2021.

2. Mr Nathan agreed with the timeline of events as presented in the Appendix to this summary.

3. The key points from Mr Nathan's evidence are summarised below.

I. Ms Raeesah Khan's ("Ms Khan") statement on 3 Aug 2021

4. On 7 Aug 2021, Ms Khan told Ms Loh Pei Ying ("Ms Loh") and Mr Nathan that:

    a. What Ms Khan had said in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 was untrue in parts.

    b. She cannot substantiate what she had said.

    c. Ms Khan had not, (contrary to what she told Parliament on 3 Aug), accompanied a victim to a Police Station.

    d. She had told Mr Pritam Singh that she had lied in Parliament.

II. Ms Khan's discussion with the Workers' Party Leadership

5. Mr Nathan felt assured because Mr Pritam Singh was aware of Ms Khan's lie. This was a serious matter that the Workers' Party ("WP") leadership should know about.

6. On 8 Aug 2021, Ms Khan met with Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap. She told them that what she had said in Parliament on 3 Aug 2021 was untrue.

7. Ms Khan then reported to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan, contemporaneously on 8 Aug 2021, what Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap told Ms Khan, in response, after she told them that she had told an untruth in Parliament. They told Ms Khan "to take the information to the grave". The Whatsapp Message to her Chat Group with Ms Loh and Mr Nathan is as follows:

    > "Raeesah WP
    > Hey guys. I just met with pritam, Sylvia and Faisal. And we spoke about the Muslim issues and the police accusation. I told them what I told you guys, and they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening."

8. On 10 Aug 2021, Mr Nathan and Ms Loh met Mr Pritam Singh on a separate matter. Mr Pritam Singh confirmed that he was aware that Ms Khan had lied to Parliament. Mr Pritam Singh did not give any indication that any clarification of the lie would be made.

9. When Ms Khan lied again on 4 Oct 2021, in Parliament, Mr Nathan was concerned for her.

10. On 12 Oct 2021, Ms Khan told Mr Nathan that she was going to make a statement in Parliament about the true position concerning her statement of 3 Aug 2021. Ms Loh then requested to meet with Mr Pritam Singh, to discuss what Ms Khan should say in Parliament, and how she should convey the truth. Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met with Mr Pritam Singh later that evening (on 12 Oct 2021).

11. At this meeting, Mr Pritam Singh told Ms Loh and Mr Nathan that he had met with Ms Khan on 3 Oct 2021 (the day before the 4 Oct Parliament sitting, when Ms Khan lied again). Mr Pritam Singh recounted that he had told Ms Khan:

    a. He had a feeling Ms Khan's (untrue) statement (made on 3 Aug 2021) might come up in Parliament again. And Ms Khan might be asked about this issue.

    b. Mr Pritam Singh told Ms Khan that if she continued the narrative, there would be no judgement against her.

    c. Mr Nathan also said that regardless of whether she maintained the lie or not, Mr Pritam Singh will not judge her. He added that that was rather indecisive.

12. Prior to 12 Oct 2021, Mr Nathan was not aware of any occasion on which the WP senior leadership had instructed Ms Khan to clarify the truth.

    a. In fact, on 3 Oct 2021, Mr Pritam Singh told Ms Khan that if she retained the narrative, there will be no judgement on her.

    b. On 4 Oct 2021, the untruth was repeated in Parliament by Ms Khan. None of the three members of the Workers' Party senior leadership (Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap) who were present in Parliament rose to clarify the facts.

13. Mr Nathan agreed with Ms Loh's evidence that the WP's statement on 1 Nov 2021 should have indicated that the WP's senior leadership were aware of Ms Khan's lie. The statement had not made clear that Ms Khan had sought counsel from the WP's senior leadership, and that Ms Khan had acted in accordance with their guidance.

14. Mr Nathan and Ms Loh were surprised when the WP set up a Disciplinary Panel ("DP") on 2 Nov.

    a. Mr Nathan thought that any inquiry should have been done earlier, given that the DP members were aware of Ms Khan's lie since 8 Aug, and knew that she had repeated the lie in Parliament on 4 Oct.

    b. Mr Nathan agreed that the DP was self-serving, and that it had contributed to an uninformed, biased and jaundiced view of the incident, because it had invited WP members and volunteers to give their views on the incident without revealing that Ms Khan had acted with the guidance of senior WP leaders (who were precisely the members of the DP itself).

15. Mr Nathan and Ms Loh went to the DP on 25 Nov 2021 and told them, inter alia, that the CEC and the DP should tell the public about the true line of events.

Appendix: Chronology (accepted by Mr Nathan in his evidence)

Date	Events	
3 Aug	(a) Ms Khan made a speech in Parliament.	
Sometime between 3 and 7 Aug	(a) Mr Nathan spoke to Ms Khan.	
7 Aug	(b) Ms Khan spoke to Mr Pritam Singh and told him that she had spoken an untruth in Parliament.	
8 Aug	(a) A meeting between Ms Khan, Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap was arranged. This took place at Mr Pritam Singh's house. (b) Ms Khan told them in clear terms that the statement she had made in Parliament was false. (c) When asked about their (Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap) reaction, Ms Khan said, it was incredible disappointment. There was a lot of anger, but there was some compassion as well. The reaction was that if she were not to be pressed, then the best thing to do, would be to retain the narrative that she began in August. (d) Ms Khan agreed that the upshot of the meeting on 8 August with Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Faisal Manap was that the Workers' Party leadership decided that there would be no need to clarify the position, they would keep the lie in place, since if Ms Khan is not pressed, there would be no need to clarify the truth. (e) After the meeting, Ms Khan sent a text to Ms Loh and Mr Nathan which stated as follows: "*Hey guys. I just met with Pritam, Sylvia and Faisal. And we spoke about the Muslim issues and the police accusation. I told them what I told you guys, and they've agreed that the best thing to do is to take the information to the grave. They also suggested that I write a statement to send out this evening*". This was sent contemporaneously at about the time when the meeting concluded.	
10 Aug	(a) Both Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met Mr Pritam Singh on a separate matter. Mr Pritam Singh confirmed that he knew about Ms Khan's falsehood in Parliament.	

Date	Events	
	(b) Ms Loh was assuaged that the senior leadership were aware and it was her expectation that the problems would be sorted out at that level.	
3 Oct	(a) Mr Pritam Singh visited Ms Khan at her home. (b) He was expecting that Ms Khan would be pressed about her lie since it was the first occasion since August 2021 that she would be back attending in Parliament. (c) Ms Khan's evidence on this occasion is that before the October sitting, she had a conversation with Leader of the Opposition, Mr Pritam Singh, and the conversation was that if she were to retain the narrative or if she were to continue the narrative, there would be no judgement.	6.
4 Oct	(a) Ms Khan answered Minister Shanmugam's questions in Parliament. (b) There were several clear and direct false statements made in response to Minister Shanmugam. (c) At that time the statements were made, Mr Pritam Singh, Mr Faisal Manap and Ms Sylvia Lim would have been aware that they were false as she was making those statements in Parliament. (d) After the speech was made, she had a meeting in the office of the Leader of the Opposition with Ms Sylvia Lim and Mr Pritam Singh. Ms Khan said there was a discussion of what the next steps should be, and that was it. That was the conclusion of the conversation.* When asked what the next steps are, she said possible police investigations and COP. There were no discussions on why she didn't comply with any apparent instruction or orders to clarify the truth. *	* Based on Ms Khan's evidence, Mr Nathan does not have personal knowledge of this meeting.
12 Oct	(a) Ms Khan contacted Ms Loh and Mr Nathan separately, and told them that she would admit and clarify the false statements in Parliament. They had a discussion. (b) Ms Loh contacted Mr Pritam Singh to arrange for a meeting. She sent this message: "*Hi, Pritam*." I said, *"[Chk] and I would like to meet with you to discuss basically what had transpired*." (c) Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met Mr Pritam Singh at 8+ pm., at his home.	

Date	Events	
Shortly after 7:30pm on 22 Oct	(a) Mr Pritam Singh, Ms Sylvia Lim, Ms Khan, Ms Loh and Mr Nathan of the WP had a meeting at WP HQ to discuss the drafting of Ms Khan's speech. (b) Mr Pritam Singh and Ms Sylvia Lim were involved in the drafting.	
1 Nov	(a) Ms Khan made speech in Parliament. (b) WP issued a statement.	
2 Nov	(a) WP set up DP.	
4 Nov	(a) Ms Loh met with Ms Khan at her house (Deepavali). * (b) Ms Khan told Ms Loh that she was asked to appear before the DP and to collect some evidence to show to the DP.	* Mr Nathan is not sure about the date but agreed there was such a meeting.
25 Nov	(a) Ms Loh and Mr Nathan met with WP DP at 8:30am. (b) They told WP DP that Ms Khan should not resign. (c) Ms Loh's evidence is that she also told them that the CEC, and especially the DP, should tell the public the true line of events which she had shared here today, that when they knew, what courses of action they took. She told them that they should make this public knowledge, barring confidential and personal information, meaning, details of Ms Raeesah Khan's life and things like that.	
29 Nov	(a) Ms Khan met with WP DP at 10:30am at WP HQ, to discuss specifically on her performance as an MP. (b) She was asked to consider resigning.	
30 Nov	(a) Ms Khan resigned.	
2 Dec	(a) WP held a press conference.	

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1st Meeting

Monday, 29 November 2021

4.00 pm

PRESENT

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin) *(in the Chair)*
Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

1. The Committee deliberated on a complaint made on 1 November 2021 by the Leader of the House, Ms Indranee Rajah, against Ms Raeesah Khan, Member of Parliament for Sengkang GRC, alleging breaches of privileges suddenly arising under Standing Order 100(7)(b).

2. *Agreed* –

   (a) that a copy of the Memorandum dated 26 November 2021, submitted by the Leader of the House, setting out the particulars of her complaint, be sent to Ms Raeesah Khan;

   (b) that oral evidence be taken on oath or affirmation from:

      i. Ms Loh Pei Ying, member of the Workers' Party and Secretarial Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan;

      ii. Mr Lim Hang Ling, member of the Workers' Party and Legislative Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan; and

      iii. Ms Raeesah Khan, Member of Parliament for Sengkang GRC.

Adjourned to Thursday, 2 December 2021

2nd Meeting

Thursday, 2 December 2021

11.00 am

PRESENT

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin) *(in the Chair)*
Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

---

1. The Committee deliberated.

2. Ms Loh Pei Ying was examined on affirmation.

3. Ms Raeesah Khan was examined on affirmation.

4. Mr Lim Hang Ling was examined on affirmation.

5. The Committee further deliberated.

6. *Agreed*, that oral evidence be heard from Mr Yudhishthra Nathan, a member of the Workers' Party.

Adjourned to Friday, 3 December 2021

3rd Meeting

Friday, 3 December 2021

11.00 am

PRESENT

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Chuan-Jin) *(in the Chair)*
Ms Grace Fu Hai Yien
Mr Desmond Lee
Ms Rahayu Mahzam
Mr Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Mr Edwin Tong Chun Fai
Mr Don Wee
Mr Zaqy Mohamad

---

1. The Committee deliberated.

2. Ms Loh Pei Ying was further examined.

3. Ms Raeesah Khan was further examined.

4. Mr Yudhishthra Nathan was examined on affirmation.

5. The Committee further deliberated.

6. Question put, "That the full video recordings of the oral evidence of: (a) Ms Loh Pei Ying, a member of the Workers' Party who was formerly the Secretarial Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan; (b) Ms Raeesah Khan; (c) Mr Lim Hang Ling, a member of the Workers' Party who was formerly the Legislative Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan; and (d) Mr Yudhishthra Nathan, a member of the Workers' Party, be published on the Parliament website.".

   The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7	*Noes, 1*
Tan Chuan-Jin	Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Grace Fu Hai Yien	
Desmond Lee	
Rahayu Mahzam	
Edwin Tong Chun Fai	
Don Wee	
Zaqy Mohamad	

Resolved, "That the full video recordings of the oral evidence of: (a) Ms Loh Pei Ying, a member of the Workers' Party who was formerly the Secretarial Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan; (b) Ms Raeesah Khan; (c) Mr Lim Hang Ling, a member of the Workers' Party who was formerly the Legislative Assistant to Ms Raeesah Khan; and (d) Mr Yudhishthra Nathan, a member of the Workers' Party, be published on the Parliament website.".

7. Question put, "That the Chairman's Special Report be read a second time paragraph by paragraph.".

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7	*Noes, 1*
Tan Chuan-Jin	Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Grace Fu Hai Yien	
Desmond Lee	
Rahayu Mahzam	
Edwin Tong Chun Fai	
Don Wee	
Zaqy Mohamad	

Resolved, "That the Chairman's Special Report be read a second time paragraph by paragraph.".

8. Question put, "That paragraphs 1 to 7 inclusive stand part of the Special Report.".

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7	*Noes, 1*
Tan Chuan-Jin	Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Grace Fu Hai Yien	
Desmond Lee	
Rahayu Mahzam	
Edwin Tong Chun Fai	
Don Wee	
Zaqy Mohamad	

Paragraphs 1 to 7 inclusive read and agreed to.

9. Question put, "That this report be the Special Report of the Committee to Parliament.".

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7	*Noes, 1*
Tan Chuan-Jin	Dennis Tan Lip Fong
Grace Fu Hai Yien	
Desmond Lee	
Rahayu Mahzam	
Edwin Tong Chun Fai	
Don Wee	
Zaqy Mohamad	

Resolved, “That this report be the Special Report of the Committee to Parliament.”.

10. *Agreed*, that the Chairman do present the Special Report to Parliament today.

Adjourned to Monday, 6 December 2021

_____