



THE UPR PROJECT AT BCU

Submitted by:

The UPR Project at BCU
Centre for Human Rights, School of Law
Birmingham City University

Submitted to:

Singapore's Universal Periodic Review
Fourth Cycle
52nd Session of the UPR Working Group
April-May 2026

About the UPR Project at BCU:

Birmingham City University's Centre for Human Rights was created in 2014 to promote human rights, ensure access to justice, and enhance the rule of law around the world. We seek to achieve this through leading research, education, and consultancy. We submit expert reports to international human rights regions, provide advisory services to governments and nongovernmental organisations, and draft legal opinions and file legal briefs in domestic courts and international human rights courts.

The Centre for Human Rights established the UPR Project in 2018 as part of our consultancy service. We engage with the Human Rights Council's review process in offering support to the UPR Pre-sessions, providing capacity building for UPR stakeholders and National Human Rights Institutions, and the filing of stakeholder reports in selected sessions. The UPR Project is designed to help meet the challenges facing the safeguarding of human rights around the world, and to help ensure that UPR recommendations are translated into domestic legal change in member state parliaments. We fully support the UPR ethos of encouraging the sharing of best practice globally to protect everyone's human rights. The UPR Project at BCU engages with the UPR regularly as a stakeholder and is frequently cited by the OHCHR. You can read more about the UPR Project here: www.bcu.ac.uk/law/research/centre-for-human-rights/projects-and-consultancy/upr-project-at-bcu

Compiled by:

Lead Author: Dr. Amna Nazir **Contributing Authors:** Dr. Alice Storey & Prof. Jon Yorke.

Contact:

Dr. Alice Storey (Lead Academic of the UPR Project at BCU) Email: Alice.Storey@bcu.ac.uk
Address: Birmingham City University, School of Law, Curzon Building, 4 Cardigan Street, Birmingham, B4 7BD, UK.

INTRODUCTION

1. Singapore is party to four of the nine core international human rights treaties, and is yet to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and its Second Optional Protocol on the abolition of the death penalty.¹ In light of the Covenant’s protection of the right to life and the prohibition against inhuman punishment, this Stakeholder Report focuses upon Singapore’s continued use of capital punishment.
2. We make recommendations to the Government of Singapore on this key issue, implementation of which would also see the State moving towards achieving Sustainable Development Goal 16 which aims for peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice for all and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.
3. We urge the State to make practical commitments in the fourth cycle of the UPR for the abolition of the punishment. As an initial measure, we call for the suspension of the capital judicial process through the initiation of an official moratorium on the death penalty. This will enable the government to make a positive commitment towards domestic *de jure* abolition.
4. In this submission, we encourage Singapore to commit to improving its human rights protection and promotion by engaging meaningfully with the UPR. This includes giving full and practical consideration to all recommendations made by Member States, effectively implementing the recommendations Singapore accepts, and actively engaging with civil society throughout the process

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A. Singapore and International Law on the Death Penalty

5. The death penalty in Singapore is grounded in its Constitution and criminal law. While Article 9 of the Constitution guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, it explicitly provides that no one shall be deprived of life or liberty “save in accordance with law”.² This constitutional safeguard allows the lawful imposition of capital punishment where prescribed by statute.
6. Under Singaporean law, the death penalty may be imposed for offences including murder, drug trafficking, terrorism-related acts, and certain firearms offences.³ The Misuse of Drugs Act and the Arms Offences Act provide for mandatory death sentences in some instances, although reforms since 2012 have allowed judges limited discretion to impose life imprisonment with caning in certain drug trafficking and homicide cases where mitigating conditions are met.⁴

7. Executions in Singapore are carried out by hanging and take place within Changi Prison.⁵ The practice remains active, with executions taking place almost every year in the past decade, primarily for drug trafficking cases. Exact statistics are released intermittently by the government, but human rights groups estimate that dozens have been executed in recent years. Singapore defends its use of capital punishment as a necessary deterrent, though it remains subject to significant international criticism.

International Law Promoting the Restriction and Abolition of the Death Penalty

8. The United Nations' framework for regulating the application of the death penalty comprises a corpus of international human rights law and jurisprudence. Of particular relevance are Articles 6, 7, and 14 ICCPR,⁶ its Second Optional Protocol,⁷ the ECOSOC Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty,⁸ the Secretary General's quinquennial reporting,⁹ the Secretary General's Question on the Death Penalty,¹⁰ and the Human Rights Committee decisions.¹¹ Other relevant treaties include the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment¹² and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.¹³

9. The General Comment on the Right to Life¹⁴ provides an interpretive lens on the death penalty and concerning ICCPR Article 6(6), which states, '[n]othing in this article shall be invoked to delay or to prevent the abolition of capital punishment,' it:

reaffirms the position that States parties that are not yet totally abolitionist should be on an irrevocable path towards complete eradication of the death penalty, de facto and de jure, in the foreseeable future. The death penalty cannot be reconciled with full respect for the right to life, and abolition of the death penalty is both desirable [...] and necessary for the enhancement of human dignity and progressive development of human rights.¹⁵

10. The growing international consensus against capital punishment is reflected in the UN General Assembly's biennial resolution to impose a global moratorium on the use of the death penalty. The tenth and most recent iteration of the resolution was passed on 17 December 2024. A total of 130 votes were recorded in favour with 32 votes against and 22 abstentions. Singapore has voted no in all such resolutions to date.¹⁶

11. In its explanation of the vote at the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on 15 December 2022, Singapore maintained that the moratorium resolution was inconsistent with international law, noting that Article 6 of the ICCPR permits the death penalty for the most serious crimes, subject to due process. It criticised the resolution for omitting reference to victims' rights and for seeking to impose a uniform approach to criminal justice across diverse legal systems, describing this as reflecting "an attitude of arrogance and cultural superiority."¹⁷ Singapore concluded that the voting outcome confirmed the absence of any international consensus on a moratorium.¹⁸

12. Singapore's voting record is also reflected in its presence as a signatory to the Joint Permanent Missions' most recent *note verbale* of dissociation, which registers a formal objection to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the attempt to establish a global moratorium on the death penalty.¹⁹
13. Through its endorsement of the *note verbale*, Singapore has reinforced its opposition to the moratorium initiative and has aligned itself with other retentionist States in the General Assembly, signalling its continued commitment to maintaining capital punishment within its domestic legal framework.

B. Implementation of Recommendations from Cycle Three in 2021

14. Singapore received 324 recommendations in the Third Cycle of which 210 were accepted and 114 noted.²⁰ A total of 37 recommendations focused on the death penalty, all of which were noted.²¹

Recommendations concerning Singapore's Adoption of International Law

15. Singapore received a significant number of recommendations concerning ratification of core international human rights treaties. Twenty of these focused directly on the ratification of the ICCPR.²² These were all noted and Singapore has not indicated any change to its position.

Recommendations concerning a Moratorium and/or Abolition

16. A number of States recommended Singapore “abolish the death penalty” or similar. This included **Paraguay** (59.121), **Romania** (59.122), **Austria** (59.123), **Sweden** (59.124), **Luxembourg**, **Canada** and **New Zealand** (59.128).
17. Others such as **Australia** (59.131), **Portugal**, **Costa Rica**, **South Africa**, **Uruguay**, **Spain**, **Malawi**, **Italy**, **Czechia**, **Poland**, **Slovenia**, **Finland**, **Albania**, **Lithuania**, **Ukraine**, **Norway**, **Netherlands** (59.132), **Brazil** (59.133), **Chile** (59.135), **Cyprus** (59.136), **France** (59.137), **Germany** (59.138), **Latvia** (59.140) recommended the State establish a moratorium with a view to legal abolition. Singapore noted all of these recommendations and continues to support the retention of capital punishment.

Recommendations concerning Review of Domestic Law

18. Several States recommended Singapore undertake a review of its domestic death penalty laws to align them with “relevant norms and standards” and introduce measures to restrict the punishment (see **Switzerland** (59.125), **Timor-Leste** (59.126), **Croatia** (59.127), **Mexico** (59.129), **North Macedonia** (59.130) and **Ireland** (59.139)). The Government noted these recommendations but has not acted on them, leaving both the legislative framework and execution practices largely unchanged.

19. Whilst such recommendations are welcomed, it is crucial that they remain specific and measurable in order to assess the level of implementation. Broad recommendations, whilst easy to accept, lack any impetus to bring about real change.²³ It is recommended that States adopt a SMART approach to recommendations as recognised by UPRinfo.²⁴ This would help Singapore initiate an incremental approach to reducing the scope of the punishment and map out the process for abolition.
20. During its review, Singapore stated that “the death penalty was an important part of the criminal justice system of Singapore. It was applied only after due process of law and with judicial safeguards. It had been an effective deterrent against the most serious crimes, such as murder and drug trafficking”.²⁵
21. In recent years, execution activity has resumed after a COVID-19-related pause and has seen a significant uptick. In August 2022, long after the temporary lapse in carrying out executions, Singapore resumed executions with the hanging of Abdul Rahim Shapiee, an Uber driver convicted of trafficking heroin. Despite having reportedly cooperated with authorities, he was executed after exhausting appeals.²⁶ Later in July 2022, another execution took place with the hanging of Nazeri bin Lajim, who had a long history of drug addiction but was deemed to be beyond the threshold of a mere courier.²⁷
22. In 2023, execution activity continued and even intensified. On 26 April, Tangaraju Suppiah was hanged for cannabis trafficking amid serious concerns about his access to legal counsel and interpretation, raising due-process concerns internationally.²⁸ Three weeks later, on 17 May, Muhammad Faizal Mohd Shariff, convicted for trafficking marijuana, was executed after his final appeal was dismissed.²⁹ Later that year, in a particularly symbolic case, Saridewi binte Djamani, the first woman executed in nearly two decades, was hanged in July 2023 after a mandatory death sentence for heroin trafficking.³⁰
23. By November 2023, sixteen executions had been carried out since the resumption in March 2022, all for drug-related offences.³¹ Overall, between 2022 and late 2024, Singapore is reported to have executed approximately 25 individuals, representing a marked increase in capital punishment enforcement post-pandemic.³²
24. Beyond the execution statistics, the domestic environment around anti-death-penalty advocacy has also deteriorated. Activists challenging the death penalty have increasingly faced legal pressure, often through tools like the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (POFMA). On 15 November 2023, several civil society groups were targeted under the law amid broader pushback on dissent.³³ Prominent activist Kokila Annamalai has notably defied a POFMA order demanding she publish corrections about her statements on the death penalty - a stand that has made her a prominent symbol of resistance but exposed her to fines or imprisonment.³⁴

25. Singapore's continued application of capital punishment, particularly in drug-related cases, demonstrates that it has yet to act upon UPR recommendations calling for restriction, moratorium, or abolition of the death penalty. Since the last review, executions have resumed at a steady pace, and civil society engagement on this issue has become increasingly constrained. While Singapore maintains its position that capital punishment is necessary for deterrence and public safety, the international human rights framework has consistently affirmed that drug offences do not meet the threshold of "most serious crimes."
26. The fourth cycle of the UPR provides an important opportunity for Singapore to engage in renewed dialogue on this issue, to consider incremental reforms that would align its domestic practice more closely with international standards, and to demonstrate progress towards its broader commitments under the Sustainable Development Goals.

C. Further Points for Singapore to Consider

The Absence of a National Human Rights Institution

27. Singapore remains one of the few developed states without a National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) established in accordance with the Paris Principles. While institutions such as the Presidential Council for Minority Rights³⁵ and the Feedback Unit (REACH)³⁶ provide limited avenues for consultation, they do not possess the independence, resources, or mandate necessary to address systemic human rights concerns.
28. The absence of an NHRI has important implications for the protection of rights in Singapore. Without an independent body, there is no national mechanism to monitor human rights compliance, including the use of the death penalty. Civil society organisations face barriers to meaningful dialogue with the government, as there is no institutionalised forum for engagement on sensitive issues. Internationally, Singapore is also unable to participate fully in global peer-learning processes, since NRHIs play a crucial role in reporting to the United Nations human rights system, including the Universal Periodic Review.
29. An NHRI could provide this missing link by acting as a bridge between government, civil society, and international institutions. It would be well-placed to conduct independent reviews of capital punishment and advise the government on pathways towards abolition. It could also facilitate public education and debate on the human rights implications of the death penalty, ensure that the perspectives of victims and families are considered in law and policy reform, and submit parallel reports to international human rights mechanisms to improve transparency and accountability.
30. We therefore urge the Government of Singapore to establish an NHRI in line with the Paris Principles, with independence, adequate resources, and a broad human rights mandate.

Such an institution should be empowered to review laws and policies on capital punishment and provide expert recommendations to Parliament and the executive, while engaging openly with civil society organisations.

Adopting the UPR Recommendations to Enable the People of Singapore to Benefit from Advances in Effective Penology

31. The right to benefit from scientific advancement should also apply to the progress in social science research on the death penalty. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 27, states, “[e]veryone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits,”³⁷ and the ICESCR article 15 (1)(b) recognises the right of everyone, “[t]o enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.”

32. Leading social science and criminological investigations into the death penalty worldwide have concluded:

[t]hose who favour capital punishment ‘in principle’ have been faced with yet more convincing evidence of the abuses, discrimination, mistakes, and inhumanity that appear inevitably to accompany it in practice. Some of them have set out on the quest to find the key to a ‘perfect’ system in which no mistakes or injustices will occur. In our view, this quest is chimerical.³⁸

33. Social science investigations now demonstrate that reflecting appropriate government means that whilst capital punishment could be created within a legitimate parliamentary process,³⁹ it is now clear that the application of the death penalty renders an illegitimate and inhumane outcome.⁴⁰ Abolition in Singapore would enable the people of the country to benefit from the advancement of the leading social scientific research on punishment policies.

The Universal Periodic Review Recommendations and the Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals

34. Singapore should consider adopting the UPR recommendations as an expression of mutual reinforcement of the government’s commitment to promoting the Sustainable Development Goals.⁴¹ The human rights values expressed in both the UPR and the SDGs can be woven together to promote policy coherence.⁴²

35. SDG 16 provides for “Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions” but the application of the death penalty is inconsistent with this goal. Specifically, SDG 16.1 aims to reduce death rates, promote equal access to justice, and “protect fundamental freedoms,” and to further this, SDG 16.A.1 identifies the importance of relevant national institutions, for building capacity at all levels, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime.

36. The use of the death penalty does not signal legitimate strength in institutions, but renders counterproductive and inhumane consequences, including a brutalising effect upon society. This was affirmed in the Special Rapporteur's report on 'pay-back' violence and killings.⁴³ The death penalty is antithetical to strong institutional processes for the fostering of the human dignity of the people of Singapore.

D. Recommendations

We recommend that, before the next cycle of review, the government of Singapore should:

- i. Uphold and enforce its international obligations to safeguard the right to life, pursuant to Articles 6, 7 and 14 of the ICCPR.
- ii. Whilst it retains the death penalty, ensure it complies with the 'most serious crimes' principle, under Article 6 ICCPR, restricting punishment to crimes of intentional killing only.
- iii. Ratify the ICCPR and its Second Optional Protocol aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.
- iv. Amend Article 9 of the Singapore Constitution to remove the provision of the death penalty.
- v. Develop, in consultation with civil society and relevant regional bodies, a comprehensive action plan to formalise its moratorium, with a view to abolition, within the next four years.
- vi. Annually publish data on the use of the death penalty. This should include the number of death sentences and executions, the nature of the offences and the reasoning behind convictions, identity of executed prisoners, and the number of death sentences commuted and pardoned.
- vii. Provide the platform for a comprehensive and inclusive public debate on the future of the death penalty in Singapore, allowing a group of people that is representative of all Singaporean citizens to share their opinions.
- viii. Affirm its commitment to SDG 16 on access to justice and strong institutions through its support at the next biennial vote on the UNGA Resolution on the moratorium on the use of the death penalty.
- ix. Accept UPR recommendations on the abolition of the death penalty, as also signalling Singapore's affirmation of commitments to SDG 16 on strong institutions.
- x. Establish its National Human Rights Commission: (a) ensuring it complies fully with the Paris Principles and (b) provide it with a mandate on legislative abolition of the death penalty.

¹ See <https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=104&Lang=EN>.

² Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (2020 REVISED EDITION) available at <<https://sso.agc.gov.sg/act/cons1963>>.

³ See 'Republic of Singapore (Singapore)', Cornell Center on the Death Penalty Worldwide <<https://dpw.lawschool.cornell.edu/database/#/results/country?id=66>>.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1976) 999 UNTS 171, Article 6 (right to life); Article 7 (the prohibition against torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment); and Article 14 (the right to a fair trial and the principle of equality of arms).

⁷ The Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, GA Res. 44/128, December 15, 1989.

⁸ Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty, Economic and Social Council Resolution, 1984/50; Additions to the Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty as Agreed by the Economic and Social Council Resolution 1989/64; and the Strengthening of the Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty as Agreed by the Economic Council Resolution 1996/15.

⁹ See eg, ECOSOC Capital Punishment and Implementation of the Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of those Facing the Death Penalty Report of the Secretary-General UN Doc E/2015/49 (13 April 2015).

¹⁰ See eg, Report of the Secretary General, Question of the Death Penalty, A/HRC/27/23, 30 June 2014.

¹¹ For example, *Judge v. Canada*, Communication No. 829/1998, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/78/D/829/1998 (2003).

¹² The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. Res. 39/46, 10 December 1984.

¹³ Article 37(a) Convention on the Rights of the Child, G.A. Res 44/25, 20 November 1989.

¹⁴ UN Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 36 (2018) on Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life, CCPR/C/GC/36, 30 October 2018.

¹⁵ *ibid* para 50.

¹⁶ Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 62/149, 18 December 2007, *adopted by 104 votes to 54, with 29 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 63/168, 18 December 2008, *adopted by 106 votes to 46, with 34 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 65/206, 21 December 2010, *adopted by 109 votes to 41, with 35 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 67/176 20 December 2012, *adopted by 111 votes to 41, with 34 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 69/186 18 December 2014 *adopted by 117 votes to 37, with 34 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 71/187, 19 December 2016 *adopted by 117 votes to 40, with 31 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 73/175 17 December 2018 *adopted by 121 votes to 35, with 32 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 75/183, 16 December 2020 *adopted by 123 votes to 38, with 24 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 77/222, 15 December 2022 *adopted by 125 votes to 37, with 22 abstentions*; Resolution on the Moratorium on the use of the death penalty, UNGA Res. 79/179, 17 December 2024 adopted by 130 votes to 32, with 22 abstentions.

¹⁷ Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ‘Explanation of Vote After the Vote by Ambassador Burhan Gafoor, Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations, on Draft Resolution XII Under Agenda Item 68 (B), “Moratorium on the Use of the Death Penalty”, Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, 15 December 2022’ available at <www.mfa.gov.sg/Overseas-Mission/New-York/Mission-Updates/Plenary/2022/12/20221215>.

¹⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁹ UNGA, ‘Note verbale dated 3 September 2021 from the Permanent Mission of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General’ (7 September 2021) UN Doc A/75/1015.

²⁰ UNHRC, ‘Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore – Addendum’ (10 September 2021) UN Doc A/HRC/48/16/Add.1, para 3; UNHRC, ‘Report of the Human Rights Council on its forty-eighth session’ (17 October 2023) UN Doc A/HRC/48/2, para 937.

²¹ See UNHRC, ‘Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore’ (22 July 2021) UN Doc A/HRC/48/16.

²² These were received from Slovenia (para), Uruguay (para), Czechia (para), Iceland (para), Finland (para), Germany (para), Latvia (para), Republic of Korea (para), Romania (para), France (para) Nepal (para), Belgium (para), Chile (para), Argentina (para), Brazil (para), Austria (para), Indonesia (para), and Italy (para).

²³ Amna Nazir, ‘The Universal Periodic Review and the Death Penalty: A Case Study of Pakistan’ (2020) 4(1) RSIL Law Review 126, 153.

²⁴ See UPRinfo, ‘For impact on the ground the UPR needs SMART recommendations’ <www.uprinfo.org/en/news/for-impact-on-the-ground-the-upr-needs-smart-recommendations> (21 October 2015).

²⁵ UNHRC, ‘Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Singapore’ (22 July 2021) UN Doc A/HRC/48/16, para 47.

²⁶ ‘Statement in Response to Media Queries’ (*Central Narcotics Bureau*, 5 August 2022) <www.cnb.gov.sg/NewsAndEvents/News/Index/statement-in-response-to-media-queries-5Aug> accessed 1 October 2025; ‘Singapore: Halt Executions and Cease Punitive Cost Orders Against Death-Row Lawyers’ (*International Commission of Jurists*, 9 August 2022) <www.icj.org/singapore-halt-executions-and-cease-punitive-cost-orders-against-death-row-lawyers> accessed 1 October 2025.

²⁷ ‘Singapore Carries Out Fifth Execution Since March’ (*Al Jazeera*, 22 July 2022) <www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/7/22/singapore-carries-out-fifth-execution-since-march> accessed 1 October 2025; *Nazeri bin Lajim v Attorney-General* [2022] SGCA 55 available at <www.elitigation.sg/gd/gd/2022_SGCA_55/pdf>.

²⁸ ‘Singapore: Arbitrary and Unlawful Execution for Drug-Related Offence’ (*Amnesty International*, April 2023) <www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2023/04/singapore-unlawfully-executes-national-for-drug-offences/>; ‘Singapore Hangs Man for Trafficking 1.5 kg of Cannabis’ (*Al Jazeera*, 17 May 2023) <www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/5/17/singapore-hangs-man-for-trafficking-1-5kg-of-cannabis> accessed 1 October 2025.

²⁹ ‘Court of Appeal Dismisses Application by Cannabis Trafficker on Death Row’ (*Channel NewsAsia*, 16 May 2023) <www.channelnewsasia.com/singapore/death-penalty-execution-cannabis-drug-trafficker-appeal-application-dismissed-3491776> accessed 2 October 2025; *Muhammad Faizal Bin Mohd Shariff v Attorney-General* [2023] SGCA 15 available at <www.elitigation.sg/gd/s/2023_SGCA_15>.

³⁰ ‘Singapore Executes First Woman in Nearly 20 Years Over 31 Grams of Heroin’ (*Al Jazeera*, 28 July 2023) <www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/7/28/singapore-executes-first-woman-in-nearly-20-years-over-31-grams-of-heroin> accessed 1 October 2025.

³¹ Harm Reduction International, ‘Report to the UN Secretary-General on the question of the death penalty pursuant to decision 18/117 and Resolution 22/11 of the Human Rights Council’ (29 March 2024) available at <<https://hri.global/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/SG-death-penalty-input-2024.pdf>>

³² Nina Motazed, Worldwide Monthly Roundup: China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, and Vietnam (*Death Penalty Info*, 4 December 2024) <<https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/worldwide-international-monthly-roundup-china-iran-saudi-arabia-singapore-and-vietnam>> accessed 2 October 2025.

³³ Nina Motazed, Worldwide Monthly Roundup: Taiwan Carries Out First Execution in Five Years; Singapore Cracks Down on Abolition Group; Iranian Prisoners Continue Peaceful Abolition Protest as at Least 87 Executed in January (*Death Penalty Info*, 6 February 2025) <<https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/worldwide-monthly-roundup-taiwan-carries-out-first-execution-in-five-years-singapore-cracks-down-on-abolition-group-iranian-prisoners-continue-peaceful-abolition-protest-as-at-least-87-executed-in-january>>

³⁴ Rebecca Ratcliffe, ‘Kokila Annamalai, The First Activist in Singapore to Defy its ‘Stifling’ Online Speech Laws’ (*Guardian*, 6 November 2024) <www.theguardian.com/world/2024/nov/06/kokila-annamalai-singapore-activist-online-speech-laws-pofma-ntwnfb> accessed 1 October 2025.

³⁵ For more info see Yee Lin Tan, ‘Presidential Council for Minority Rights’ (*National Library Board*, last updated 1 September 2025) <www.nlb.gov.sg/main/article-detail?cmsuid=98b489aa-a067-4c08-95ea-7ba69fb42e8e> accessed 1 October 2025.

³⁶ See ‘About Us’ (18 December 2024, *Reach*) <www.reach.gov.sg/who-we-are/about-us/>.

³⁷ It is further recalled that the Human Rights Council determined that the basis of the Universal Periodic Review includes consideration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, see, Institution-building of the United Nations Human Rights Council, A/HRC/RES/5/1 18 June 2007.

³⁸ Roger Hood and Carolyn Hoyle, *The Death Penalty: A Worldwide Perspective* (5th edn, Oxford University Press 2015) 7-8.

³⁹ John Rawls stated, “[a]t some point, the injustice of the outcomes of a legitimate democratic procedure corrupts its legitimacy,” in, *Political Liberalism* (Columbia University Press 2005) 248.

⁴⁰ Austin Sarat stated, “law cannot work its lethal will and ally itself with the killing state while remaining aloof and unstained by the deeds themselves,” in, *When the State Kills: Capital Punishment and the American Condition* (Princeton University Press 2001) 21.

⁴¹ See the UN Sustainable Development Goals website, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>.

⁴² The first two cycles of the UPR were reviewed under a data mining procedure and of the circa. 50,000 recommendations, it was possible to link more than 50% of those to SDG targets, see, The Danish Institute for Human Rights, Linking the Universal Periodic Review to the SGGS, p. 2.

⁴³ Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, Mission to Papua New Guinea (3 to 14 March 2014), A/HRC/29/37/Add.1, 30 March 2015, para. 96, “...several interlocutors shared the opinion that the death penalty might actually lead to further killings... given the payback culture. While the Special Rapporteur condemns the existence of the payback culture, he acknowledges that payback-related killings might increase if the death penalty is carried out.