

POFMA-DC-2026-03-03

23 Mar 2026

Xu Yuan Chen (alias Terry Xu) and Miao Yi Infotech Ltd

Served via electronic communication to [terry@theonlinecitizen.com](mailto:terry@theonlinecitizen.com), [admin@theonlinecitizen.asia](mailto:admin@theonlinecitizen.asia), [theonlinecitizen@gmail.com](mailto:theonlinecitizen@gmail.com), [myinfotech@proton.me](mailto:myinfotech@proton.me), and [heidohai@gmail.com](mailto:heidohai@gmail.com).

Dear Sirs,

**CORRECTION DIRECTION (THE “DIRECTION”)  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 11 OF THE PROTECTION FROM ONLINE FALSEHOODS AND  
MANIPULATION ACT 2019 (THE “ACT”)**

We refer to the following material (“**Subject Material**”) posted by you, which contains false statements of fact (“**Subject Statements**”) that are being communicated in Singapore:

**Table**

<p><b>Uniform Resource Locator (“URL”) of the online location where the Subject Statements are communicated</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="https://theonlinecitizen.com/2026/03/09/the-chair-was-empty-the-question-wasn-t">https://theonlinecitizen.com/2026/03/09/the-chair-was-empty-the-question-wasn-t</a></li> <li>2. <a href="https://www.theonlinecitizen.com">https://www.theonlinecitizen.com</a></li> <li>3. <a href="https://heidoh.com">https://heidoh.com</a></li> <li>4. <a href="https://www.facebook.com/100064590917823/posts/1367778368718514">https://www.facebook.com/100064590917823/posts/1367778368718514</a></li> <li>5. <a href="https://www.instagram.com/p/DVqJ52RAWxY">https://www.instagram.com/p/DVqJ52RAWxY</a></li> </ol>
<p><b>Subject Statements (“SS”)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney-General Lucien Wong has not recused himself from acting on matters pertaining to the compulsory acquisition of 38 Oxley Road.</li> <li>2. During the Committee of Supply debate on 2 March 2026, Ms Sylvia Lim was not permitted to raise any follow-up questions on the Attorney-General’s re-appointment process.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. The Constitution provides for the Attorney-General to retire at age 60 without any qualification or proviso, but the Prime Minister has appointed Attorney-General Lucien Wong until he is 75.</p>
<p><b>Subject Material from which the Subject Statements are derived</b></p>	<p><b><u>For Subject Statement 1</u></b></p> <p><b>“The Recusal That Was Never Renewed</b></p> <p>There is one question about Lucien Wong's fourth term that nobody in Parliament has formally answered — because nobody has been allowed to ask it properly.</p> <p>In July 2017, when Wong's appointment first drew fire over his prior role as Lee Hsien Loong's personal lawyer in the Oxley Road family dispute, then-PM Lee addressed it head-on.</p> <p>"Lucien Wong was my lawyer," he told Parliament. "I have lost a good lawyer. He is not advising me anymore on this matter. In the AGC, the Government cannot use Lucien Wong either to advise it on this matter because he is conflicted."</p> <p>Indranee Rajah had been equally explicit the day before: Wong was not advising the Ministerial Committee on 38 Oxley Road. Full stop.</p> <p>That assurance was specific to a specific moment — a family dispute still being managed privately, a Ministerial Committee studying drawer plans, and Lee Wei Ling still living in the house. The matter was, as Lee put it, a private disagreement that did not require a government decision.</p> <p>That moment has passed.</p> <p>Lee Wei Ling died in October 2025. Lee Hsien Yang submitted a demolition application. The government responded by gazetting 38 Oxley Road as a national monument in December 2025 — overriding the founding father's repeatedly stated wish that the house be torn down.</p> <p>In January 2026, the government formally commenced compulsory acquisition proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act. Lee Hsien Yang has since publicly denounced the decision, calling the monument "a monument to the PAP's dishonour of Lee Kuan Yew."</p>

This is no longer a private family dispute. It is active government legal action — compulsory acquisition, heritage designation, compensation proceedings — against a property owned by the brother of the man who appointed Lucien Wong to his job three times.

And in the middle of all this, Wong was reappointed to a fourth term in January 2026.

The 2017 recusal was never renewed. No statement has emerged from the AGC confirming that Wong has recused himself from any aspect of the Oxley Road acquisition — the legal advice on gazetting, the compulsory acquisition process, the compensation framework, or any potential legal challenge mounted by Lee Hsien Yang.

If it exists, the government has not publicised it. If it does not exist, the government has not explained why not.

This matters in a way that goes beyond procedural neatness. The AG is the government's principal legal adviser. He is also the Public Prosecutor, with personal discretion over any criminal proceedings.

The acquisition of 38 Oxley Road from Lee Hsien Yang — a man who has publicly called the government's actions dishonourable, whose dispute with the previous Prime Minister was the very reason Wong's impartiality was questioned in the first place — is precisely the kind of matter that demands a clear, on-the-record declaration of recusal.

Instead, we have silence. Worse, we have a Parliament in which the one MP who pressed these questions was not permitted to follow up after Tong concluded his remarks. The Speaker did not call her. The debate closed.”

...

In 2017, Lee Hsien Loong at least had the standing to say, in his own name, that Wong was out of the Oxley matter. He said it at the podium, on the record, in Parliament. Whatever one thinks of the original appointment, the accountability was visible.

In 2026, the man who made the fourth reappointment did not show up to defend it. The question of whether his AG has recused himself from an active government acquisition of his predecessor's brother's property was not asked — and was not allowed to be pursued when it was raised.

The 2017 assurance covered 2017. The facts of 2026 demand a new one. We are still waiting.”

### **For Subject Statement 2**

#### **“The Question That Wasn’t Allowed to Land**

What makes this episode more troubling than a routine ministerial defence is what happened after Tong concluded his remarks. Speaker Seah Kian Peng did not call on Lim to respond. The debate closed. Her follow-up — on specific questions that remained unanswered — was simply not heard.

In 2017, the Parliament that debated Lucien Wong's first appointment allowed more than thirty Members to speak over two days, with the Prime Minister taking questions directly.

In 2026, the MP who filed the cut on his fourth reappointment was not permitted a follow-up after the government responded on behalf of the PM.

Lim's questions — whether there was a shortlist, whether succession was being planned — are not procedural niceties. They go to whether Singapore's highest legal office is being managed as an institution or as a personal appointment. The absence of an answer, and the absence of any opportunity to press for one, is its own kind of answer.

...

Sylvia Lim was right to ask. Parliament was wrong not to let her follow up. And the Prime Minister's empty chair told us more than Tong's prepared remarks ever could.

#### **The Recusal That Was Never Renewed**

There is one question about Lucien Wong's fourth term that nobody in Parliament has formally answered — because nobody has been allowed to ask it properly.

...

Instead, we have silence. Worse, we have a Parliament in which the one MP who pressed these questions was not permitted to follow up after Tong concluded his remarks. The Speaker did not call her. The debate closed.

In 2017, Lee Hsien Loong at least had the standing to say, in his own name, that Wong was out of the Oxley matter. He said it at the podium, on the record, in Parliament. Whatever one thinks of the original appointment, the accountability was visible.

In 2026, the man who made the fourth reappointment did not show up to defend it. The question of whether his AG has recused himself from an active government acquisition of his predecessor's brother's property was not asked — and was not allowed to be pursued when it was raised.”

### **For Subject Statement 3**

“When Lee Hsien Loong appointed his former personal lawyer as Attorney-General in 2017, he stood at the podium and defended it himself. When Lawrence Wong reappointed the same man — now 72, for a fourth consecutive term — he sent his Law Minister instead. That absence speaks louder than anything Tong said.

...

When Workers' Party MP Sylvia Lim raised questions about the AG's fourth consecutive reappointment during the Ministry of Law (MinLaw)'s Committee of Supply debate on 2 March 2026, it was Minister for Law Edwin Tong who fielded the questions — not the Prime Minister whose constitutional prerogative the appointment actually is.

The cut had originally been filed to the Prime Minister's Office. It was redirected to MinLaw. Tong himself acknowledged this at the outset, noting he was responding "on behalf of the Prime Minister."

A constitutional appointment made on the Prime Minister's advice, defended by someone else. That tells you something.

### **A Man Past the Retirement Age, for the Fourth Time**

Lucien Wong was appointed AG in 2017. He was reappointed in 2020, again in 2023, and now again in January 2026. He will be 75 when this term expires. The retirement age for the AG role, under Article 35(4) of the Constitution, is 60 — a threshold Wong has exceeded by fifteen years and counting.

When Wong was first reappointed in 2020 at 67, he became the oldest person ever to hold the office. He broke his own record in 2023. He has now done it again.

Lim asked two direct questions: whether other candidates had been shortlisted, and whether succession planning was in place. Neither was answered. Tong instead delivered a defence of the appointment process in general terms — the consultations with the Chief Justice, the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, the Council of Presidential Advisers. He invoked institutional safeguards. He warned that naming candidates publicly would deter capable lawyers from being considered.

What he did not do was explain why, in a legal community of Singapore's calibre, no one else was ready to take over from a man now well into his seventies, after twelve years.

### **The Counterargument, and Why It Falls Short**

To be fair to Tong, the procedural argument he offered is not without substance. The appointment process does involve multiple constitutional actors. The President is not a rubber stamp — the CPA advises independently. And there is genuine logic to the concern that publicising candidate deliberations would chill the pool of willing nominees.

But the argument proves too much. It would justify opaque reappointment of the same individual indefinitely, on the grounds that any scrutiny risks politicisation. That is not a defence of institutional integrity. It is a defence of institutional closure.

	<p>And Tong's explanation for the fourth term — that Wong's continuity was important for "ongoing sensitive matters," including maritime boundary negotiations, tax reforms, and cross-border criminal matters — raises more questions than it answers. Singapore's AGC employs some of the finest legal minds in Asia. Are we to believe that not one of them could manage these briefs? That institutional knowledge so uniquely resides in a single individual that he must be retained past seventy-five?"</p>
<p><b>Date/Time when the Subject Statements were first communicated in Singapore</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Website post was communicated on 9 March 2026.</li> <li>2. The link to s/n 1 on <a href="https://www.theonlinecitizen.com">https://www.theonlinecitizen.com</a> was communicated on 9 March 2026.</li> <li>3. The link to s/n 1 on <a href="https://heidoh.com">https://heidoh.com</a> was communicated on 9 March 2026.</li> <li>4. The Facebook post was communicated on 9 March 2026, 1720 hrs (GMT+8).</li> <li>5. The Instagram post was communicated on 9 March 2026.</li> </ol>

2 The Minister for Law and Second Minister for Home Affairs, Mr Edwin Tong SC (the “**Minister**”), is of the opinion that it is in the public interest to issue this Direction. The basis on which the Subject Statements are determined to be false statements of fact is set out in **Annex A**.

3 Pursuant to Section 11 of the Act, the Minister directs you to communicate the following correction notices in the form and manner as prescribed below.

## Website

- 4 You must insert the following correction notice in relation to the website post at <https://theonlinecitizen.com/2026/03/09/the-chair-was-empty-the-question-wasn-t>.

CORRECTION NOTICE:

This post contains false statements of fact. For the correct facts, visit: <https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>

- 5 The preceding correction notice:
- (a) Must be in the form of additional text, situated at the top of the said website post.
  - (b) Must include a clickable hyperlink.
  - (c) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
  - (d) Must be in a font size that is not smaller than the largest font size on the said website post.
  - (e) Must be inserted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600 hrs (GMT+8)**.
- 6 In addition, you must post the following correction notice on the main page of the websites at:
- (a) <https://theonlinecitizen.com>;
  - (b) <https://www.theonlinecitizen.com>; and
  - (c) <https://heidoh.com>.

CORRECTION NOTICE:

An earlier post (dated 9 March 2026) contains false statements of fact.

For the correct facts, visit: <https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>

- 7 The preceding correction notice:
- (a) Must be at the top of the said main page of the website, except that if there are any existing POFMA notices therein, this correction notice must be placed directly below the existing POFMA notices.
  - (b) Must be in the form of text in a font size not smaller than the largest font size on the said main page of the website.
  - (c) Must include a clickable hyperlink.
  - (d) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
  - (e) Must be inserted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600 hrs (GMT+8)**.

### ***Pinned Post***

- (f) In addition, the new post must remain at the top of the same main page of the website until **20 Apr 2026, 1200 hrs (GMT+8)**.

## **Facebook**

8 You must insert the following correction notice in relation to the Facebook post at <https://www.facebook.com/100064590917823/posts/1367778368718514>.

**CORRECTION NOTICE:**

This post contains false statements of fact. For the correct facts, visit: <https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>

- 9 The preceding correction notice:
- (a) Must be in the form of additional text, situated at the top of the said Facebook post.
  - (b) Must include a clickable hyperlink.
  - (c) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
  - (d) Must be inserted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600 hrs (GMT+8)**.

10 In addition, you must post the following correction notice on your Facebook page, ie, the Facebook page accessible at <https://www.facebook.com/100064590917823>.

**CORRECTION NOTICE:**

An earlier post (dated 9 March 2026) contains false statements of fact.

For the correct facts, visit: <https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>

- 11 The preceding correction notice:
- (a) Must be in the form of a new Facebook post.
  - (b) Must be in the form of text, situated at the top of the new Facebook post.
  - (c) Must include a clickable hyperlink.
  - (d) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
  - (e) Must be posted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600 hrs (GMT+8)**.

***Pinned Post***

- (f) In addition, the new post must be pinned such that it remains at the top of all the posts on your Facebook page until **20 Apr 2026, 1200 hrs (GMT+8)**.
- (g) The new post must be immediately visible upon accessing your Facebook page on any device or platform interface, without requiring any further navigation to view it, except that if there are any existing POFMA notices therein, this correction notice must be placed directly after the existing POFMA notices.

## Instagram

12 You must insert the following correction notice in relation to the Instagram post at <https://www.instagram.com/p/DVqJ52RAWxY>.

**CORRECTION NOTICE:**

This post contains false statements of fact. For the correct facts, visit:  
<https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>

13 The preceding correction notice:

- (a) Must be in the form of additional text, situated at the top of the caption of the said Instagram post.
- (b) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
- (c) Must be inserted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600 hrs (GMT+8)**.

14 In addition, you must post the following correction notice on your Instagram page, ie, the Instagram page accessible at <https://www.instagram.com/theonlinecitizen>.

**CORRECTION NOTICE:**

An earlier post (dated 9 March 2026) contains false statements of fact.

For the correct facts, visit:  
**<https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326>**

15 The preceding correction notice:

- (a) Must be in the form of a new Instagram post.
- (b) Must be in the form of the image above, a copy of which is attached to the email conveying this Direction.
- (c) Must be published as a public post visible to all general users.
- (d) Must be posted by **23 Mar 2026, 1600hrs (GMT+8)**.

***Pinned Post***

- (e) In addition, the new post must be pinned such that it remains at the top of all the posts on your Instagram page until **20 Apr 2026, 1200hrs (GMT+8)**.

**Publish in The Straits Times**

16 Pursuant to Section 11(3)(b) of the Act, you are also required to publish the following correction notice in The Straits Times.

# CORRECTION NOTICE

On 9 March 2026, Xu Yuan Chen (alias Terry Xu) and Miao Yi Infotech Ltd published an article on certain websites and social media pages of The Online Citizen that contained these falsehoods: (i) the Attorney-General Lucien Wong (“AG Wong”) has not recused himself from acting on matters pertaining to the compulsory acquisition of 38 Oxley Road, (ii) during the Committee of Supply (“COS”) debate on 2 March 2026, Ms Sylvia Lim was not permitted to raise follow-up questions on the AG’s re-appointment process, and (iii) the Constitution provides for the AG to retire at 60 without qualification or proviso, but the Prime Minister has appointed AG Wong until he is 75.

**These statements are false.**

**The correct facts:** AG Wong has recused himself from matters pertaining to 38 Oxley Road, and therefore did not act in those matters. Ms Sylvia Lim was allowed to raise follow-up questions during the COS debate, as reflected in the public record. AG Wong’s re-appointment by the President was made in accordance with the Constitution, which permits appointments beyond 60.

These facts show that proper processes and safeguards were followed, contrary to the false statements made.

For the full facts, visit  
<https://www.factually.gov.sg/corrections-and-clarifications/230326> or scan the QR Code.



Published by Xu Yuan Chen (alias Terry Xu) and Miao Yi Infotech Ltd

- 17 The preceding correction notice:
- (a) Must be in the form above (which includes the exact text and QR code), a copy of which is attached to the email conveying this Direction, subject to any formatting amendments made by SPH Media Limited (“SPH”).
  - (b) Must be ¼ page (27cm x 3 columns) sized, in black and white, and published on the third page of the main section of The Straits Times. If the third page is unavailable, the preceding correction notice must be published on the second page.
  - (c) Must be sent via email to SPH at [mop\\_pofma@sph.com.sg](mailto:mop_pofma@sph.com.sg) to arrange to publish the correction notice, with the POFMA Office [admin@pofmaoffice.gov.sg](mailto:admin@pofmaoffice.gov.sg) kept on copy in all correspondence.
  - (d) Must be published by **26 Mar 2026**. To meet this requirement, the booking for publication with SPH must be completed by **25 Mar 2026, 1200 hrs (GMT+8)**.
- 18 For the avoidance of doubt, you are responsible for any costs of complying with this Direction.

### **Important notes**

19 Failure to comply with this Direction without reasonable excuse is an offence under Section 15 of the Act.

20 You can apply to the Minister to vary or cancel this Direction. Any application to vary or cancel this Direction must be made in writing and sent to [pofma@mlaw.gov.sg](mailto:pofma@mlaw.gov.sg), with [admin@pofmaoffice.gov.sg](mailto:admin@pofmaoffice.gov.sg) kept on copy in all correspondence. You may use the standard form available at <https://pofmaoffice.gov.sg/resources/application-form>, or otherwise satisfy the requirements that are set out in Regulation 13(3) of the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Regulations 2019.

21 Any application to vary or cancel this Direction does not operate as a stay of the Direction. The Direction will remain in effect until it expires or is cancelled following the Minister’s consideration of the application.

22 If the Minister refuses any variation or cancellation application that is brought in respect of this Direction, whether in whole or in part, you may appeal to the General Division of the High Court of Singapore pursuant to Section 17 of the Act against the Direction.

23 Any appeal that is brought against this Direction does not operate as a stay of the Direction, unless the General Division of the High Court directs pursuant to Section 17(7) of the Act that the Direction be stayed pending determination of the appeal. The Direction will cease to have effect only if it is set aside by the General Division of the High Court or the Court of Appeal, or if it expires or is cancelled following a decision of the Minister.

Yours faithfully

Director (Directions & Compliance)  
for Executive Director,  
POFMA Office  
Info-communications Media Development Authority

## Annex A

The basis on which the Subject Statements referenced in the Table are determined to be false statements of fact is set out below:

### Subject Statement 1

1. As stated in Parliament on 3-4 July 2017, Attorney-General (“**AG**”) Lucien Wong (“**AG Wong**”) has recused himself from matters pertaining to 38 Oxley Road, and therefore did not act in those matters. This includes the compulsory acquisition of 38 Oxley Road. Any statement or suggestion that AG Wong may have acted or is acting in conflict of interest in such matters is entirely without basis.

### Subject Statement 2

2. During the Committee of Supply (“**COS**”) debate on 27 February 2026, Ms Sylvia Lim asked the Government about the AG’s re-appointment process. Minister Edwin Tong addressed Ms Lim’s questions in his response in Parliament on 2 March 2026.
3. After Minister Tong’s response, like 5 other Members of Parliament (“**MPs**”), Ms Lim was allowed to raise follow-up questions, and Ms Lim in fact asked two questions to which Minister Tong responded, as reflected in the public record.
4. Due to the time limit for the COS, all MPs have to make good use of the limited time to ask their questions.
5. This does not mean that MPs lack other opportunities to pose questions to the Government. In addition to posing questions during the Parliamentary debates, including the COS debates, MPs like Ms Lim may file Parliamentary Questions (“**PQs**”) to Ministers. In this regard, Ms Lim filed a PQ in October 2025 regarding the AG’s re-appointment process but subsequently withdrew it. She then chose to ask questions about the AG’s re-appointment during the COS debates, under the well-established procedure and time limits for such debates. Ms Lim or other MPs can still file PQs on the topic, if they wish.

### Subject Statement 3

6. AG Wong’s re-appointment by the President was made in accordance with the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore (“**the Constitution**”), which permits appointments beyond 60
7. First, the suggestion that an AG must retire at 60 is incorrect and false. Under Article 35(4) of the Constitution, an AG may be appointed either:

- a. for a specific period, in which case the age limit of 60 years does not apply; or
  - b. for a non-fixed term, in which case, the AG will serve until the age of 60 but may continue to hold office thereafter with the agreement of the AG and the Government, provided that the President, acting in his own discretion, concurs with the advice of the Prime Minister ("**PM**").
8. Second, PM Lawrence Wong did not re-appoint AG Wong. Under our Constitution, it is the President, not the PM, who appoints or re-appoints the AG. Pursuant to Article 35(4) of the Constitution, it was President Tharman Shanmugaratnam, acting in his discretion and concurring with the PM's advice, and having consulted the Council of Presidential Advisers, who re-appointed AG Wong.