

Prosecution Cases in 2023**Individual cases**

S/N	Case details	Case outcome
1.	A 32-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating an unregistered registrable UA in a manner likely to endanger the safety of any person or property, within a Restricted Area and at an altitude exceeding 200ft above mean sea level (AMSL) without a Class 2 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 9 January 2023 of four charges and took into consideration the remaining 26 charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$20,000.</p>
2.	A 25-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating an unregistered registrable UA for a purpose that is neither a recreation purpose nor an education purpose without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit and in a manner reckless as to whether the life or property of another person could be endangered.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 1 February 2023 of three charges and took into consideration the remaining four charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$23,000.</p>
3.	A 24-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating an unregistered registrable UA within 5 km of an aerodrome and at an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 13 February 2023 of two charges and took into consideration the remaining six charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$10,000.</p>
4.	A 51-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating an unregistered registrable UA within 5km of an aerodrome and at an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 27 March 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the remaining two charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of S\$5,000.</p>
5.	A 25-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating a UA within 5km of an aerodrome and at	The Court convicted the offender on 19 May 2023 of two charges and took into

	an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	consideration the remaining four charges. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$10,000.
6.	A 30-year-old male Employment Pass holder was charged for operating a UA within 5 km of an aerodrome and at an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	The Court convicted the offender on 15 November 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the other remaining charge. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$4,000.
7.	A 29-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating a UA within 5km of an aerodrome and at an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	The Court convicted the offender on 22 November 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the other remaining charge. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$5,000.
8.	A 35-year-old male Singaporean was charged for operating a UA within 5km of an aerodrome and at an altitude exceeding 200 ft AMSL without a Class 2 activity permit.	The Court convicted the offender on 6 December 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the other remaining charge. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$5,000.

Company cases

S/N	Case details	Case outcome
1.	A marine salvage company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	The Court convicted the offender on 17 May 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the other remaining charge. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$5,000.
2.	A construction company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	The Court convicted the offender on 22 May 2023 of eight charges and took into consideration the remaining 51 charges. The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$45,000.

3.	A solar energy company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 3 July 2023 of two charges and took into consideration the remaining eight charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$7,000.</p>
4.	A construction and engineering company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 2 August 2023 of three charges and took into consideration the remaining five charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of S\$18,000.</p>
5.	A construction and engineering company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 2 August 2023 of two charges and took into consideration the remaining two charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of S\$10,000.</p>
6.	A construction and engineering company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 12 September 2023 of four charges and took into consideration the remaining six charges.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of S\$24,000.</p>
7.	A solar energy company was charged for operating a UA in the course of business without a UA operator permit and a Class 1 activity permit.	<p>The Court convicted the offender on 27 September 2023 of one charge and took into consideration the other remaining charge.</p> <p>The offender was sentenced to a total fine of \$5,000.</p>

