

Singapore Cases - Details of Trial Records

Compiled by Stephanie Beckman, Intern
U.C. Berkeley War Crimes Studies Center
Singapore Cases: No. 235/972
Wakayama Case

Accused: (1) Civ. WAKAYAMA Yukio
(2) Civ. KAWATOKO Keiji
in the service of the Occupying Power

Place and Date of Trial: Singapore, 29-31 Jan, and 1, 3 & 4th
Feb 1947

Finding and Sentence:

Accused Charge - Not guilty Charge - Guilty Sentence
1 - 1st charge 3 months imprisonment
2 - 1st (w/exception), 2nd charge 6 months imprisonment

Note: Accused 2 guilty of the 1st charge with exception of
words "Abdul Hakim".
There was no printed finding and sentence by the court.

Charge: 1st charge: (Against both accused)
Committing a War Crime in that they at Central Police
Station, Singapore, whilst in the service of the Occupying
Power, in or about the month of January 1945, were, in
violation of the laws and usages of war, concerned in the ill-
treatment of SEAH YAU HAP, SAID BIN AHMED,
MOHAMED SALLEH BIN AMIN, ABBAS BIN ABDUL
MANAP, ABDUL HAKIM, NAWI and one AMAN, all
civilian inhabitants of Singapore, resulting in physical
suffering to the aforementioned civilians.

2nd charge: (Against accused 2 only)
Committing a War Crime in that he at Singapore, whilst in the
service of the Occupying Power, between 1st December 1944
and the 28th February 1945, was, in violation of the laws and
usages of war, concerned in the ill-treatment of KALLEAPAN
GOPAL, K. APPASAMY, MURUGIAH and S. VATHEYAN,
all civilian inhabitants of Singapore, resulting in physical
suffering to the aforementioned civilians.

Facts relating to the charge: The abstract of evidence provided
details of the case.

Charge 1:

On or about the night of 31 December 1944 a lorry was stolen
from the compound of the Central Police Station, Singapore.
As a result of this theft accused 1, officer in charge Central
Police Station ordered the arrest of 8 persons, civilian
residents of Singapore employed in the transport section of
the police: the arrests took place between the 1st and 8th of
January 1945. Investigations concerning the theft were

conducted by the first accused assisted by accused 2, superintendent i/c Detective Brance, Central Police Station. Four witnesses, all persons arrested in connection with the theft of the lorry, will give evidence before the court.

SEAH YAU HAP will say that: -

I was arrested on 5 January 1945, and detained in Central Police Station. I was interrogated by the 1st and 2nd accused, and severely beaten for 15 minutes by the 1st accused. I was then questioned and still denied any knowledge of theft. Nawi, a transport driver was brought into the room and he said that I had stolen the lorry. I was again beaten for 20 minutes and again denied any knowledge of the theft. The first and second accused then thrashed Nawi and me for about one and a half hours with three bamboo canes fastened together and a wooden baton.

The next day, 6th June, a driver name Aman, who died in prison, Nawi and myself were again interrogated by accused 1, who beat each of us for 20 minutes. The following day I was interrogated by accused 1 but not tortured.

On 8th of January Accused 1 interrogated me and gave me the water torture.

On 11th of January Nawi and myself were both given the water torture by accused 1.

On 13th January I was brought before Accused 1 and on his order I was hung so that only my head and shoulders were touching the ground, he then gave me the water torture.

Approximately a week later I was taken to Telok Ayer Police Station by two Malay Policemen. I admitted stealing nuts and bolts.

A few days later accused 1 told us we were to be released as we had not stolen the lorry.

SAID bin AHMED will say that he was interrogated by both 1st and 2nd accused, was severely beaten and both Accused assisted in administering the water torture.

MOHAMED SALLEH bin AMIN will describe being interrogated and beaten by both accused.

ABBAS bin ABDUL MANAP was beaten and given the water torture by both accused.

ABDUL HAKIM was beaten and given water torture by the 1st accused.

CHEAH KIM SWEE, who was employed as a police inspector, will corroborate the evidence of SEAH YAU HAP.

Charge 2:

In or about December 1944, investigations were being made concerning the murder of Tamil SATHIVELLU. The two accused were in charge of these investigations. On or about 27th December 1944, four persons GOPAL, APPASAMY, MURUGIAH and VATHEYAN, all civilian residents of Malaya, were arrested on suspicion of being concerned in the murder.

ELLIOTT EMANUEL DAVIES will say:-

In December 1944 I was employed as a clerk in the Detective Branch in Central Police Station. In or about December 1944 four Tamils, one by the name of GOPAL, were arrested and interrogated by the accused 2. I was interpreter at this interrogation. Accused 2 severely beat each of the four men for a period of about 1 hour with a rattan which was about 3 feet long and half an inch thick. I was not at all present when any of these persons were interrogated.

KALLEAPAN GOPAL will say:-

I was arrested on 20 December 1944 and was detained in Paya Lebar Police Station. On the thirteenth day of my arrest I was transferred to Central Police Station where I was beaten and interrogated by the Officer-in-Charge. Three other persons VATHEYAN, APPASAMY and MURUGIAH were arrested at or about the same time as me. All three of these men died in Outram Road Gaol.

Corroborative evidence will be given by NADESAN, PACKIRISAMY, K. NARAYANASAMY, C. ABDUL KARIM and TEH HUI ENG.

Statements made by the accused persons will be tendered in evidence.

Accused handling of the charge: In their defence the accused gave evidence on oath. Accused 1 admitted using a cane on the civilians and also pouring water on them. Accused 2 admitted striking civilians with a small rattan and pouring water over them.

Main issues of the case raised by prosecution and defense:

The closing addresses of defence and prosecution were both missing and hence all facts of the case can only be inferred from the abstract of evidence and charge sheet. I feel that the sentences passed were extremely light considering the extent of their ill-treatment, as provided in the abstract of evidence. With any cases of ill-treatment, any sentence under 5 years imprisonment is considered a light sentence.

[back to top](#)

© 2004, Regents of the University of California