

IN THE STATE COURTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

[2026] SGDC 284

District Arrest Case No. 904457 of 2026 & Ors
Magistrate's Appeal No. 9115 of 2026-01

Public Prosecutor

Against

Muhammad Faiz Bin Suhaimi

JUDGMENT

[Criminal Law] — [Statutory Offences] – [Penal Code 1871]

[Criminal Procedure and Sentencing] — [Sentencing]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FACTS	3
PRESCRIBED PENALTIES	8
ANTECEDENTS.....	8
PROSECUTION’S SUBMISSIONS ON SENTENCE.....	8
DEFENCE’S MITIGATION AND SUBMISSIONS ON SENTENCE	10
DECISION ON SENTENCE	11
CONCLUSION	16

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
Muhammad Faiz Bin Suhaimi

[2026] SGDC 284

District Arrest Case No 904457 of 2026 & Ors

District Judge Ong Luan Tze
26 Aug 2026

14 September 2026

District Judge Ong Luan Tze:

1 This case involves the falsification of competition results which were used to support the nomination of athletes for selection to represent Singapore in the 32nd SEA Games (“2023 SEA Games”) which was held from 5 May 2023 to 17 May 2023 in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. As a result of these falsified records, six athletes were selected to represent Singapore in the 2023 SEA Games, when they would not otherwise have been selected.

2 The accused pleaded guilty to one charge under s 465 read with s 109 of the Penal Code for engaging in a conspiracy with one Ho Ho Huat (“Ho”) to make a false electronic record with the intent to commit fraud.

3 Two other similar charges under s 465 read with s 109 of the Penal Code were taken into consideration for the purpose of sentencing. These involve the same falsified records, in different forms.

4 Having heard both the Prosecution’s submissions on sentence as well as the accused’s mitigation, I impose a term of one week’s imprisonment for the proceeded charge.

Facts

5 By way of background, the accused was a team manager and coach of fin swimming at the Singapore Underwater Federation (“SUF”), while the co-accused Ho was the Vice President (Sports) and Head Coach of fin swimming at SUF at the material time. SUF is the National Sport Association (“NSA”) responsible for promoting underwater and aquatic sports in Singapore, including fin swimming.

6 Sometime in December 2022, the selection process by the Singapore National Olympic Council (“SNOC”) for athletes to represent Singapore at the 2023 SEA Games was ongoing. One of the featured sports in the 2023 SEA Games was fin swimming.

7 During this time, Ho found out that some fin swimming events had been removed from the 2023 SEA Games. This meant that some of the athletes that Ho had hoped to be selected could not be selected. Ho wanted to nominate more fin swimming athletes for the 2023 SEA Games through the appeal process in February 2023. In order to do so, he needed the athletes to have qualifying results in a sanctioned competition.

8 Ho knew that the Malaysia Underwater Sports Federation (“MUSF”) was organising the 1st Malaysian Fin Swimming Championship (“the Malaysian Championship”) in Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia, from 7 January 2023 to 8 January 2023. He reached out to the President of the MUSF, Ravivarma Sanmugam (“Ravi”) to request to send Singapore athletes to the event. This was eventually acceded to by Ravi.

9 Ho then sent the following five Singapore male athletes to participate in the Malaysian Championship:

- (a) Chew Ming En, Lucas (“Lucas”);
- (b) Seow Zi Hao, Damien (“Damien”);
- (c) Choon Jun Jie, Nicholas (“Nicholas”);
- (d) Ong Jun Han, Jordan (“Jordan”); and
- (e) Anton Yeo Wen Xuan.

10 No female athletes from Singapore participated in the Malaysian Championship. Ho and the accused also attended the event, together with an assistant coach of fin swimming at SUF, one Lee Quan Hua Gary (“Lee”).

11 At the Malaysian Championship, the five Singaporean male athletes participated in a demonstration swim as well as various individual and relay events. However, they did not participate in the 4 x 200 metres relay surface event.

12 A few days after the Malaysian Championship, Ho brought up the idea of falsifying the results of the event to the accused and Lee. While the accused and Lee were initially hesitant about the plan, they eventually relented and agreed to participate. They did so because Ho was more senior than them, and they were afraid to question him. The three of them discussed the athletes they intended to nominate for the appeal process, as well as the sporting events and possible timings to include in the falsified result slip. They needed to ensure that

the timings were good enough for the athletes to stand a good chance of being selected for the 2023 SEA Games, but without arousing suspicion over the authenticity of the results.

13 On 18 January 2023, and pursuant to this conspiracy, the accused used a software known as Meet Manager to make a false electronic record named “1st Malaysia fin swimming championship” containing falsified results of Events 255, 256, 257 and 258 at the Malaysian Championship.¹ The false electronic record stated the following:

- (a) Event 255 stated that Lucas, Damien, Nicholas and Jordan had competed in a 4 x 200 metre relay event and attained a timing of 6:55:23 when they did not compete in this event.
- (b) Event 256 stated that four female athletes from Singapore had participated in a 4 x 200 metre relay event when no female athlete from Singapore attended the event.
- (c) Events 257 and 258 related to mixed relay events and included names of male and female athletes from Singapore who were not present at the Malaysian Championship.

14 This false electronic record was sent to Tam Wai Meng (“Tam”) who was the Sports Performance Manager of fin swimming.

15 On 1 February 2023, pursuant to this conspiracy, the accused entered the falsified results of Events 255, 256, 257 and 258 from the Malaysian Championship on the SportsSync platform. This is an online athlete data

¹ See Annex A to the Statement of Facts.

management system through which the respective NSAs can submit qualifying results of their athletes for the consideration of the SNOC Selection Committee.

16 On 3 February 2023, Lee’s grandmother passed away and he did not further participate in these discussions.

17 On 3 February 2023, Tam asked the accused for the official results of the Malaysian Championship. The accused discussed this with Ho, and they agreed to add the falsified results to the official result sheet of the Malaysian Championship. Pursuant to this conspiracy, this was done on 5 February 2023, when Ho altered the result sheet of the Malaysian Championship by inserting the falsified results of Events 255, 256, 257 and 258.²

18 Drafts of this document were sent to the accused to check and after some inconsistencies were amended, this document was sent *via* email to Tam. Ho sent this email to Tam with the intention of inducing SNOC to select athletes to represent Singapore at fin swimming events at the 2023 SEA Games when they would not otherwise have been selected.

19 Following the appeal process, the following athletes were selected to represent Singapore at the 2023 SEA Games:

- (a) male athletes - Lucas, Damien, Nicholas and Jordan
- (b) female athletes - Ang Hui Hsien Jamie (“Jamie”), Ho Zi En Jovita (“Jovita”), Ong Vanessa (“Vanessa”) and Ting Hiu Ying Bernice (“Bernice”)

² See Annex B to the Statement of Facts.

20 Of these eight athletes, Jamie and Vanessa had already been selected for another 2023 SEA Games event as well. The remaining six athletes would not have been selected to represent Singapore at the 2023 SEA Games at all, if not for the falsified results. In addition, Jovita was Ho’s daughter.

21 SNOC incurred an additional expense of S\$15,691.15 that it would not have incurred if these six athletes had not been sent for the 2023 SEA Games.

Events following the offences

22 On 22 December 2023, Ho was removed from his position as Vice President (Sports) of the SUF.

23 On 10 January 2024, the accused and Lee informed an anonymous whistleblower about the falsification of the fin swimming results at the Malaysian Championship. They also provided information on their own participation in the falsification. The accused expressed regret for his actions.

24 On 11 April 2024, the whistleblower informed the then-President of SNOC, Minister for Sustainability and the Environment Grace Fu, and the SNOC was directed to commence investigations into the matter.

25 On 29 May 2024, Ravi was contacted by Benson Seow (“Seow”), the Sports Performance Manager of SportSG responsible for overseeing SUF, to provide the official results of the Malaysian Championship. Ravi informed Ho about this, and Ho then instructed Ravi to send the falsified document to Seow. Ravi did this accordingly.

26 On 1 July 2024, SNOC convened a Committee of Inquiry (“COI”), which eventually found, among other things, that the results submitted for

consideration were indeed falsified and that Ho had played a pivotal role in the falsification.

27 On 18 March 2025, the SNOC lodged a police report regarding the falsified results.

28 The accused was arrested on 25 March 2025 and released on agency bail on 27 March 2025.

Prescribed penalties

29 The charge under s 465 read with s 109 of the Penal Code 1871 3(2) POHA is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to 4 years, or with fine, or with both.

Antecedents

30 The accused is untraced.

Prosecution's submissions on sentence

31 While pointing out the many aggravating factors in the present case, the Prosecution submitted for a fine of between \$10,000 to \$15,000, based primarily on the accused's whistleblowing disclosure which eventually led to the discovery of these offences. It was emphasized that if not for this specific set of circumstances, the Prosecution would have sought a custodial sentence.

32 The Prosecution acknowledged that there appeared to be no sentencing precedents involving materially similar facts, namely the falsification of sporting results which was used successfully to influence a national body's selection of athletes for an international Games. Therefore, it was suggested that

the court should calibrate the appropriate sentence by reference to (a) the harm caused by the offences and (b) the accused's culpability.

33 With reference to harm, the Prosecution pointed out the following:

(a) This was not merely a technical falsification of records. The forged results achieved their intended purpose and altered an official national selection outcome.

(b) The offending caused direct financial harm to the amount of S\$15,691.15.

(c) Significant time and resources had been expended by SNOC, Sport Singapore and the COI to establish what occurred.

(d) There was also non-financial harm because the offending compromised the integrity of the SportSync system and damaged confidence in the integrity and public image of Singapore sport.

34 With reference to culpability, the Prosecution pointed out that the accused's involvement was deliberate and sustained. However, his culpability was lower than that of Ho's.

35 More importantly, the Prosecution submitted that there were exceptional factors in the present case for which substantial credit could be given to the accused, such as the following:

(a) The accused voluntarily disclosed the offences following Ho's removal as Vice President (Sports). At the time he disclosed these offences, no investigations had commenced and there was no indication that the falsification was otherwise about to be uncovered. It was this

disclosure that eventually led to the commencement of investigations and the lodging of the police report.

(b) Such offences were not readily detectable and there was public interest in encouraging a guilty person to disclose the offence he had committed. (Refer to *PP v Siew Boon Loong* [2005] 1 SLR(R) 611 at [15]-[18].) Ho's behaviour in actively trying to conceal the falsification when investigations commenced highlighted the extent to which Ho would have gone to hide the offences, and therefore the importance of the accused's disclosure.

(c) The accused had indicated his plea early and saved time and resources.

36 Based on the above, the Prosecution submitted for a stiff fine.

Defence's mitigation and submissions on sentence

37 In mitigation, counsel also asked for a fine of \$10,000 to be imposed, relying on the following factors:

(a) The accused was not the mastermind in this conspiracy and was taking instructions from Ho. The accused was intimidated by Ho, who was his senior.

(b) The accused had no real personal interest in the enterprise.

(c) The accused came clean at the earliest opportunity.

(d) The accused rendered full cooperation and disclosure to the authorities and chose to plead guilty early.

- (e) The accused was not a sophisticated individual and had no antecedent.

38 The Defence also aligned itself with the Prosecution’s position that substantial mitigating weight ought to be given to the accused’s voluntary disclosure of the offences before any official inquiry into the falsification commenced.

39 In addition, testimonials from the accused’s trainees were tendered, to demonstrate his good character and professionalism.

Decision on sentence

40 The aggravating nature of the present offence does not need much further elaboration. The Prosecution has already correctly identified many of these factors in its submissions to the court. To assess and place these factors in their proper context, I agree with the Prosecution that the concept of “harm” and “culpability” are two useful parameters to guide the analysis. To reiterate the guidance in *PP v Koh Thiam Huat* [2017] 4 SLR 1099 at [41], the concept of “harm” is a measure of the injury which has been caused to society by the commission of the offence, whereas “culpability” is a measure of the degree of relative blameworthiness disclosed by an offender’s actions and is measured chiefly in relation to the extent and manner of the offender’s involvement in the criminal act.

41 In my assessment and based on the factors as highlighted by the Prosecution, the harm in this case must *at least* be moderate. I consider the following to be particularly relevant:

(a) The falsification of results was done for the purpose of supporting a fraudulent claim in a selection process where athletes would be chosen to represent Singapore in an international competition. What ought to have been a sacrosanct process was dishonestly twisted by the accused and the co-accused persons into something to be used for their own personal agenda.

(b) As a result of these false records, six athletes were chosen to represent Singapore when they would not otherwise have been selected, and this eventually led to a direct financial harm of S\$15,691.15.

(c) Apart from this financial harm, the actions by the accused and co-accused persons compromised the integrity of the selection process and damaged the reputation and public image and confidence regarding the quality of our Singapore sportsmen and sportswomen. It is a slap in the face for many of our athletes who have put in countless hours of hard work and sacrifice to achieve excellence in their field and the coveted chance to represent our country.

42 In terms of culpability, there is no doubt that Ho was the more culpable of the two. However, this is not mitigating and does not necessarily mean that the accused's culpability was low. The accused was a team manager and coach of fin swimming. Being a sportsman himself who is passionate about fin swimming, one would have expected him to have upheld the integrity of the sport but instead he allowed himself to be led into this nefarious scheme. While I appreciate that there was some reluctance on the part of the accused initially to participate in this conspiracy, the fact is that he ultimately agreed to do so and his involvement was not merely peripheral. The accused was actively involved in the discussions and planning and was in fact the one who used a

software to create the first electronic record with the falsified results. I cannot agree that he had no personal interest in the matter. His interest was to keep his job. At the very least, the accused's culpability would be at the high end of low.

43 As the Prosecution has rightly pointed out, the usual sentence for such offending is a custodial term. The two cases highlighted by the Prosecution involve custodial terms, even though the scale of offending in those cases is, in my view, dwarfed by the present set of circumstances.

44 In *Lai Jenn Wu v PP* [2013] 4 SLR 1134, the offender found a wallet with a blank cheque and attempted to forge the owner's signature to obtain a sum of \$50,000. This was not successful when the forgery was uncovered by the bank officer. As the offence was "premeditated, deliberate and determined", the High Court confirmed at [3] that anything less than a non-nominal term of imprisonment would not be sufficient. However, because no loss was eventually caused, the High Court reduced the sentence from four months' imprisonment to two months' imprisonment. The offender had no antecedents.

45 In *Tan Kim Huat v PP* [2014] SGHC 100, the offender forged four documents (two letters to the Land Transport Authority ("LTA"), a sales and purchase agreement and an insurance certificate) in his attempt to have a vehicle transferred back to him after a failed contract. In upholding the sentence of four weeks' imprisonment, the High Court considered that the fraud was perpetrated on a public institution and agreed that there was a need for deterrence to maintain public confidence in LTA records. The offender did not have any relevant antecedents.

46 Even though there is no case precedent involving a similar falsification of records for the purposes of influencing a national sports selection outcome,

there are still common threads that run through the precedent cases and the present case. These cases all relate to a false document used to support a fraudulent claim. The main difference is that while in the precedents, the fraudulent claim usually only pertains to the individual's own interest and therefore has a limited scope of impact beyond the individual himself and the immediate recipient of the false document, the fraudulent claim in the present case pertains to the quality of national athletes being selected to compete for Singapore at the international level. The scale of offending is significantly different and does not weigh in the accused's favour.

47 Despite the above, both the Prosecution and Defence submits that a fine would be appropriate for this case. Their argument is premised on one main point – that the accused had voluntarily revealed the commission of this offence, apart from which it was unlikely that this offence would have been uncovered.

48 I agree that substantial mitigating weight ought to be given to this factor. First, it demonstrates genuine remorse. Second, there is clearly public interest in encouraging people to step forward and own up to their offending.

49 However, the weight to be attributed to this must be balanced against the severity of the offending, and the public interest in deterring such offences from arising in the first place.

50 In the case of *PP v Siew Boon Loong* [2005] SGHC 20 (“*Siew Boon Loong*”), the accused had already been released from prison for a separate offence when he voluntarily surrendered to the police for the offence of criminal breach of trust under s 406 of the Penal Code (Cap 224, 1985 Rev Ed) (“1985 Penal Code”). The High Court agreed that credit could be given to remorse shown through a plea of guilt, and there was public interest in encouraging a

guilty person to come forward to disclose his wrongdoing. However, even having accepted that, the High Court still observed at [27] that the sentence of six weeks' imprisonment for each charge was inadequate, although not manifestly so as to warrant an increase on appeal.

51 I acknowledge that each case must be determined on its own facts. The offences faced by the offender in *Siew Boon Loong* were of a different nature, with a different punishment provision³. The offender was also traced, albeit with dated antecedents.

52 In any case, the more important point is that credit given to a voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and genuine show of remorse does not necessarily take the form of a non-custodial sentence. This is so even when the offender voluntarily surrenders to the police as in the case of *Siew Boon Loong*. The accused in the present case did not surrender to the police.

53 For the reasons as I have detailed at [41] and [42] above, I found that the gravity of the present offending warranted a custodial term.

54 I applaud the accused's courage in disclosing the offences and his role in them and accept that the accused has shown genuine remorse with his voluntary disclosure and early plea of guilt. I also accept that substantial mitigating weight should be given for these two factors, but I do not think that they are enough to justify a shift of the sentence from a custodial term to a non-custodial one. In my view, the strong public interest in deterring such offences involving the selection of national athletes takes precedence, and the balance

³ At the relevant time, the offence under s 406 of the 1985 Penal Code was punishable with imprisonment up to three years, or with fine, or with both.

still falls squarely within the zone of a custodial sentence, *albeit* a short one. A term of one week's imprisonment will be imposed.

Conclusion

55 To don the Singapore colours at an international sporting event like the SEA Games is the dream of countless aspiring athletes – men and women who have devoted years of their lives to the sport, enduring sacrifice and hardship in pursuit of a single chance to represent their country. What the accused and the co-accused persons did was to make a mockery of that dream. By falsifying the very results on which selection depended, they struck at the integrity of a process that every athlete is entitled to trust. We owe it to those athletes — and to the spirit of sport itself — to ensure that the pathway to national representation is governed by nothing other than honest assessment and scrupulously accurate results.

56 It is for these reasons that a custodial sentence is warranted. At the same time, the accused's early plea of guilt and his voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing are matters that weigh meaningfully in his favour, and the court has given them due credit. In my view, a sentence of one week's imprisonment strikes the appropriate balance between sending an unequivocal message that the falsification of competition results for the purpose of manipulating a national selection process will not be tolerated, while fairly reflecting the remorse and candour the accused has demonstrated.

57 The sentence will be backdated to the date of his arrest on 25 March 2025 to take into account the two days the accused spent in remand before he was released on bail on 27 March 2025.



Ong Luan Tze



District Judge
Ong Luan Tze

Dhiraj G Chainani and Eugene Ho (Attorney-General's Chambers)
for the Public Prosecutor;
Nakoorsa A.K, Nicholas Say Gui Xi and Dwi Heryanno
(Nakoordsha Law Corporation) for the Accused.
