

# L. F. VIOLET NETTO

L. F. Violet Netto  
M. Ravi  
Colin S L Phan

A Law Firm

---

101 Upper Cross Street #05-13 People's Park Centre Singapore 058357  
Tel 65-65337433 • Fax: 64387597 • Email: mravilaw@singnet.com.sg

Your Ref:  
Our Ref: MR.6489.14

**BY FAX, POST & EMAIL**  
Fax No. 6472 3033  
NPARKS\_Central\_Cluster@nparks.gov.sg

23 October 2014

**National Parks Board Headquarters**     **IMMEDIATE**  
1 Cluny Road  
Singapore Botanic Gardens  
Singapore 259569

**Attn: Dr Leong Chee Chiew, Commissioner of Parks and Recreation, National Parks Board**

Dear Sir,

**HAN HUI HUI** [REDACTED]  
**NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR USE OF SPEAKERS' CORNER**

1. We act for Ms Han Hui Hui in the above matter.
2. Our client has shown us your letter dated 21 October 2014 which purports to cancel (on 3 days' notice) the permit which she applied for on 28 September 2014 and on 19 October 2014, both of which were granted to her to use Speakers' Corner at Hong Lim Park on 25 October 2014 for the purposes of holding a speech and demonstration, (the Event"). She has sought our advice in relation to this letter.
3. The reason given for the cancellation - that our client is "*assisting the Police with investigations into an incident which occurred during the "Return Our CPF Event" at the Speakers' Corner on 27 September 2014*" constitutes, we submit, a breach of our client's rights of freedom of speech and assembly under

Article 14 of the Constitution, and is ultra vires Regulation 8(3) of the Parks and Trees Regulations (Cap. 216. R 1), inasmuch as the act of assisting the Police does not constitute nor can it be construed as an implication, assertion or proof of guilt of any offence, nor does it constitute evidence of a breach of any law or of the terms and conditions of approval for the Return Our CPF Event. There is therefore no rational basis for the revocation and it is wholly unreasonable as being based on irrelevant considerations. Furthermore our client emphatically rejects your characterisation of the fact that she has been interviewed by the police and has been assisting them in their enquiries as constituting a "case" against her, and it is submitted that this is in itself an error of law that vitiates your decision.

4. The imposition of a restriction on our client that "*no approval will be granted for any application that [she] may make to speak or organise any demonstration or performance/exhibition at the Speakers' Corner until the conclusion of Police investigations or resolution of [her] case*" is likewise a breach of our client's rights of freedom of speech and assembly under Article 14 of the Constitution, and is ultra vires Regulation 8(3) of the Parks and Trees Regulations (Cap. 216. R 1), inasmuch as the act of assisting the Police can does not constitute nor can it be construed as an implication, assertion or proof of guilt of any offence, nor does it constitute evidence of a breach of any law or of the terms and conditions of approval for the Return Our CPF Event. Depending how long the Police investigations take, the restriction may last indefinitely. It is an indeterminate, wholly disproportionate and oppressive ban.
5. There is therefore no rational basis for the ban on applying for a permit and it is beyond the limited powers of Regulation 8(3) of the Act as being irrational, wholly unreasonable and based on irrelevant considerations. Insofar as this ban is prompted by your mischaracterisation of the fact that she has been interviewed by the police and has been assisting them in their enquiries as constituting a "case" against her, it is submitted that this is in itself an error of law that vitiates your decision.
6. The purpose of Speaker's Corner is to provide an arena in which free speech is allowed to be exercised and it appears wholly out of keeping with this purpose for the residual authority given to a Commissioner of Parks and Recreation under Regulations to effectuate the Parks and Trees Act to deny and place a ban on free speech in the very place where it supposed to be allowed.
7. The very short notice you have imposed effectively precludes our client from seeking any sort of legal redress in the Courts in time to enable the

Event to proceed. This is regrettable.

8. Since the ban on any future applications for permission to speak or organise any demonstration, performance or exhibition amounts to the imposition of a ban for an indeterminate period of time, which is in principle a profound threat to her Constitutional rights, our client has instructed us to formally request that this ban be lifted immediately and in any event not later than 1600 hours on 24 October 2014, failing which our client reserves the right to apply to the Court for relief without further notice to you.
9. We are instructed to place on notice our client's profound sense of regret that in a democratic society like Singapore her Constitutional rights and freedoms have been curtailed so drastically on a premise that in her submission is flawed, and all her rights are reserved.
10. We reserve the right to bring this letter to the attention of the Court in any proceedings relating to this matter.

Yours faithfully,

  
M Ravi  
cc. client