



Telephone: +65 6336 1411
E-Mail: AGC@agc.gov.sg
Writer's DID: +65 63325340
FAX: +65 3390286

AGC | ATTORNEY-
SINGAPORE | GENERAL'S
CHAMBERS

06 Jul 2012

By Email: yawningbread@gmail.com

Mr Au Waipang
(also known as Mr Alex Au)
Yawning Bread

Sir,

CONTEMPTUOUS POST ON YAWNINGBREAD.WORDPRESS.COM

1. We refer to your post of 18 June on the blog site, 'Yawning Bread on Wordpress' titled 'Woffles Wu case hits a nerve' (url: <http://yawningbread.wordpress.com/2012/06/18/woffles-wu-case-hits-a-nerve/>).
2. Your post alleges that our Courts are biased towards those whom you describe as well-connected. You state that:-

This ... isn't going to disabuse anyone of his belief that the law is not blind and that the police, prosecutors and judges are indulgent towards the well-connected. And frankly, even if the authorities can explain all the details, it may achieve nothing either, for the belief didn't spring from just this case alone. (emphasis added)

3. You have sought to back up your allegation of judicial bias by referring, *inter alia*, to past cases (without specifying them). In essence you allege that our entire judicial system has been biased for a long time.
4. These are serious allegations which scandalise our Courts. Your allegations are scurrilous and false.
5. We ask that you take down the post within 5 days of the date of this letter and publish this letter as well as an apology in the terms enclosed with this letter. If you fail to do so, then contempt proceedings will be commenced against you.
6. Contempt of Court is a serious offence. Nevertheless we have decided that no proceedings will be commenced against you if you withdraw your comments and apologise.
7. We would also point out to you that your allegation of judicial bias, in relation to the Woffles Wu case, is based on a number of distortions of the facts of the case:-
 - a. Woffles Wu was charged under section 81(3) of the Road Traffic Act. You imply that he should have been charged under section 182 of the Penal Code, thus suggesting that Woffles Wu was treated favourably.

- b. In fact, section 81(3) of the RTA and section 182 of the Penal Code before February 2008 attracted the same maximum fines and the same maximum custodial sentence.
- c. Woffles Wu could have been sent to jail for a maximum of 6 months under section 81(3) of the RTA, which was the provision under which he was charged.
- d. You also refer to cases cited by one Mr Choo Zheng Xi, and suggest, on that basis, that Woffles was treated better. If you look at the actual facts of the cases cited by Mr Choo, you will see that in all these cases, the false statements were used to cover up more serious offences like rash driving, drink driving, driving without a license and so on.
- e. Cases show that when the false declaration related to a minor offence, such as speeding just above the warning range and which is normally compoundable (as in the Woffles Wu case), generally a fine was imposed.

8. Enclosed is an Apology which we require you to publish together with this letter.

Yours faithfully,



Aedit Abdullah, S.C.
for ATTORNEY-GENERAL