

19 May 2025

Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council  
GPO Box 2360  
Brisbane Qld 4001  
Submitted: submissions@sentencingcouncil.qld.gov.au

Dear Committee Members,

Please accept this submission based on the questions in the Consultation Paper in ‘Assessing the Impacts of Domestic and Family Violence Sentencing Reforms in Queensland’.

### **Q1. Impact of Section 9(10A): Aggravating Factor in Sentencing for DFV Offences**

*Has the aggravating factor changed court sentencing practices? If yes, how?*

Research indicates that the introduction of Section 9(10A) has led to some changes in sentencing practices:

- A 2024 study by the Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS) found that domestic violence (DV) offences were more likely to result in custodial penalties compared to non-DV offences, particularly in the Magistrates Courts for offences like common assault and assault occasioning bodily harm (AOBH).
- On average, courts imposed longer custodial sentences for DV offences compared to non-DV offences, although this was not consistent across all offence types and court levels

While the inclusion of s 9(10A) is a significant step in acknowledging the seriousness of domestic and family violence, available evidence and survivor experience suggest that its impact on sentencing practices has been inconsistent and, in many cases, minimal.

Where changes have occurred, they include:

- Some courts now make more explicit reference to the domestic violence context during sentencing remarks, acknowledging the power dynamics, coercive control, and breach of trust involved.
- In a limited number of serious assault or repeat offender cases, the aggravating factor appears to have resulted in more custodial sentences or longer terms of imprisonment.
- The reform has driven some improvements in magistrate and judge training about DFV dynamics, although this remains uneven across Queensland.

*If sentencing practices have not changed significantly, what are the reasons?*

Despite some changes, several factors may limit the impact of Section 9(10A):

- The aggravating factor is not uniformly applied across all cases. Some courts may not explicitly reference the DV context in sentencing remarks, leading to variability in outcomes.
- DV offences may be underreported or misidentified, resulting in charges that do not reflect the DV context, thereby affecting the application of the aggravating factor.

- Courts must balance the aggravating factor with other considerations, such as the offender's background or mitigating circumstances, which can dilute its impact.

### **Measures to Assess the Impact of the Reform**

To effectively assess the impact of Section 9(10A), the following measures are important:

- Reviewing sentencing remarks to determine whether courts are explicitly acknowledging the DV context and applying the aggravating factor.
- Comparing sentencing outcomes for DV offences before and after the implementation of Section 9(10A) to identify trends in penalty severity and types.
- Monitoring reoffending rates among DV offenders to evaluate the deterrent effect of harsher penalties.
- Assessing the frequency and influence of victim impact statements in sentencing decisions.
- Disaggregate sentencing impacts by gender, First Nations status, and rural vs. urban courts.

### **Factors Impacting the Operation of the Reform**

Several factors may influence the operation of Section 9(10A):

- The broad discretion afforded to judges can lead to inconsistent application of the aggravating factor.
- Magistrates and Judges outdated views about DFV or minimise the seriousness of emotional or coercive control.
- Variations in training and awareness about DV dynamics among judicial officers can affect how the aggravating factor is applied.
- The interplay between Section 9(10A) and other legislative provisions, such as Section 9(10B), which considers if the offender is also a victim of DV, can complicate sentencing decisions.
- Inconsistent charging practices can limit how courts frame the offence at sentencing.
- The adversarial process remains intimidating and unsafe for survivors, which can reduce the availability of context or impact statements that might support appropriate aggravation.
- Limited resources for courts and support services may hinder the effective implementation of the reform.

### **Additional Considerations**

- Understanding the lived experience of victims/survivors, especially First Nations women, is critical to assess how sentencing outcomes reflect (or fail to reflect) the harm caused.
- Intersectional analysis: Research should examine how race, gender, disability, and class intersect to influence sentencing outcomes and the recognition of DFV dynamics.
- Queensland should examine sentencing practices in jurisdictions with specific DFV courts or specialist DFV judicial officers.

- Further research is needed into whether harsher sentencing leads to meaningful deterrence or behavioural change, especially in repeat DFV offenders.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and reach of current DFV training for judges, prosecutors, and defence counsel.

While Section 9(10A) has led to some changes in sentencing practices for DV offences, its impact is moderated by various factors, including inconsistent application and systemic challenges. Ongoing assessment, training, and resource allocation are essential to enhance the effectiveness of the reform and ensure it achieves its intended outcomes.

## **Q2. Impact of Increased Maximum Penalties for Contravention of a DVO**

*What has been the impact of increased maximum penalties for contravention of a DVO on court sentencing practices?*

Have sentencing practices changed?

While the legislative intention behind increasing maximum penalties for DVO breaches was clear, greater accountability, deterrence, and protection for victim-survivors the available evidence suggests that actual court sentencing practices have not meaningfully shifted.

### **Key Observations:**

- Custodial sentences remain rare for first-time breaches, even after the increase in maximum penalties. This aligns with broader research showing that higher maximum penalties do not automatically translate into harsher or more consistent sentencing outcomes.
- Fines remain a common penalty, even in cases involving repeated non-physical intimidation or stalking behaviour, which are often minimised or referred to as "technical breaches".

Statements made from FACAA and Parole Board Queensland reflect an overarching concern that the current sentencing culture does not align with community expectations of accountability and deterrence in family violence contexts.

### **What measures are important to assess the impact of this reform?**

To evaluate whether the reform is achieving its intended effect, the following indicators are critical:

- Disaggregated data on breach type (e.g. coercive control vs. assault vs. contact via phone or social media).
- Monitoring of repeat offences and sentencing trends for recidivists.
- Comparative data from other jurisdictions, such as New South Wales and Victoria, which have implemented DFV-specific courts (e.g. the NSW *Domestic Violence Court Advocacy Service*), and use intensive monitoring.
- Stakeholder perspectives, including magistrates, victim advocates, legal practitioners and frontline services, particularly in regional or Indigenous communities.

What factors could be impacting the operation of this reform?

- Contact breaches such as messages or phone calls are often minimised by courts despite their role in the pattern of coercive control. This underestimation undermines the protective intent of DVOs.
- As Queensland moves toward criminalising coercive control, courts may still be operating under outdated paradigms that separate physical violence from emotional, psychological, and social abuse.
- Availability of behaviour change programs and therapeutic interventions for perpetrators may impact whether courts feel custodial penalties are justified or rehabilitative alternatives are viable.
- Institutional misidentification of victims as perpetrators (notably for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and migrant women), who may breach DVOs issued against them despite being the primary victim.

### **Other important considerations or research**

#### **Coercive Control Recognition**

Recent coronial inquests have drawn national attention to the systemic failure of legal and justice frameworks to adequately identify and respond to coercive control, which often precedes lethal forms of domestic violence.

In the 2022 inquest into the murders of Hannah Clarke and her three children, Queensland State Coroner Terry Ryan recommended the criminalisation of coercive control, highlighting its insidious nature and its role in escalating to fatal violence. The Coroner found that Hannah Clarke had made repeated efforts to seek help but that authorities failed to properly assess the pattern of coercive behaviour being used by her estranged husband. Ryan noted:

*“The criminalisation of coercive control has the potential to improve the safety of individuals at risk of domestic and family violence by better recognising and responding to the insidious patterns of abuse that precede lethal violence.”*

Similarly, in the 2020 inquest into the murders of Jack and Jennifer Edwards by their father, the New South Wales Coroner found that multiple systemic failures occurred due to a lack of understanding and response to coercive control. The children's mother had reported escalating abuse, but agencies failed to act on the broader pattern of control and intimidation.

These tragic cases underscore the urgent need for sentencing practices and legislative reforms to move beyond a narrow, incident-based approach to domestic and family violence. Sentencing that fails to account for coercive patterns of abuse not only minimizes the lived experience of victim-survivors but also allows dangerous offenders to escape accountability until violence escalates to irreparable harm.

### **Q3. Aggravating Factor and Compatibility with Human Rights**

## Compatibility with the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) and International Instruments

The inclusion of an aggravating factor for domestic and family violence (DFV) under s 9(10A) of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 (Qld) is, in principle, compatible with the objectives of the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) and international human rights standards, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). This is because it seeks to uphold the rights of victim-survivors to life, protection from violence, and equal treatment before the law, as outlined in:

- HRA s 16 (Right to life)
- HRA s 17 (Protection from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment)
- HRA s 15 (Right to equality before the law)

Domestic and family violence disproportionately affects women and children, particularly First Nations women, women with disabilities, culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) women, and LGBTIQ+ people. The aggravating factor serves to recognise the serious nature and long-term harm of DFV, thereby affirming the state's obligation to take positive protective measures under the HRA and CEDAW.

### Concerns Regarding Disproportionality and Discrimination

However, while the intention behind the aggravating factor is protective, its application must be carefully scrutinised to ensure it does not unjustifiably infringe upon other human rights, particularly for defendants who are themselves vulnerable, such as:

- People with cognitive, psychosocial, or intellectual disabilities (as raised by DVConnect)
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who are already overrepresented in the criminal justice system
- Survivors of DFV who are misidentified as perpetrators, particularly women retaliating in self-defence or under duress

Sisters Inside Inc rightly points out that mandatory punitive frameworks, including aggravating factors applied without discretion, risk perpetuating racialised and gendered inequalities, particularly when systems fail to properly consider the social and structural contexts of violence.

Moreover, where Section 9(10B) (which allows for mitigating consideration where the offender is also a victim of domestic violence) is not consistently or effectively applied, the rights of some defendants—especially victim-survivors—may be unjustly restricted or infringed.

### Relevant International Human Rights Instruments

- UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) – Article 13 recognises the need for access to justice on an equal basis, including reasonable accommodation in legal processes.
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) – Article 14 provides for the right to a fair trial and proportional sentencing.

- CEDAW General Recommendation No. 35 calls on States to ensure laws addressing violence against women are implemented without discrimination and with due attention to intersecting forms of disadvantage.

### **Recommendations for Reform to Ensure Compatibility**

While Section 9(10A) is largely compatible with the goals of the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) in protecting the rights of victim-survivors, its implementation must be balanced, trauma-informed, and cognisant of intersectional disadvantage to avoid unjust outcomes for vulnerable defendants. Enhanced judicial discretion, application of mitigating provisions, and systemic training are crucial to ensure both protection and fairness in sentencing practices.

### **Q4. Systemic Disadvantage and Cultural Considerations**

Sentencing reforms in the domestic and family violence (DFV) context must be evaluated through a lens of systemic disadvantage, intersectionality, and cultural safety. While reforms such as increased penalties and the aggravating factor under section 9(10A) of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 (Qld)* aim to protect victim-survivors and deter offending, they risk producing unintended and discriminatory impacts on already over-policed and marginalised populations unless balanced with appropriate judicial discretion, trauma-informed practices, and alternatives to custody.

### **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples**

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples particularly women experience DFV at significantly higher rates than non-Indigenous Australians. At the same time, they are vastly overrepresented in the criminal justice system.
- According to *Change the Record* (2020), Aboriginal women are 32 times more likely to be hospitalised due to family violence and 10 times more likely to die from violent assault.
- Misidentification of Aboriginal women as primary aggressors is a documented systemic failure, often arising from poor police practices and failure to consider historical trauma, coercive control, and community dynamics.
- The imposition of harsher penalties without community-led alternatives can deepen cycles of harm and incarceration, particularly for women criminalised for survival actions or defensive violence.

### **Recommendations:**

- Require cultural reports (similar to Bugmy reports in NSW) during sentencing to properly inform courts about systemic disadvantage and historical context.
- Invest in and prioritise community-led, Indigenous-designed justice responses, including healing programs, on-Country diversion options, and family violence prevention initiatives

## **Women and Girls**

- Many women convicted of DFV-related offences are themselves victim-survivors, acting under duress, coercion, or misidentified as aggressors.
- The Women's Policy Group submission to the National Plan notes that incarceration of women for DFV-related offences often reflects a failure of systemic support, including housing, mental health care, and trauma-informed policing.
- Penal responses can further entrench harm by separating women from their children, triggering child protection interventions, and causing loss of income and housing.

### **Recommendations:**

- Ensure consistent application of Section 9(10B) as a mitigating factor where the defendant is also a victim of DFV.
- Avoid reliance on mandatory or presumptive sentencing for women without thorough risk and trauma assessment.

## **People from Other Cultural Backgrounds**

- Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities face language barriers, visa-related vulnerabilities, and cultural stigma around help-seeking, which can affect both offending and victimisation.
- Fear of immigration consequences may deter victim-survivors from reporting or seeking help, while defendants may lack adequate legal representation or interpretation, affecting plea and sentencing outcomes.

### **Recommendations:**

- Fund specialist multicultural legal and DFV services.
- Ensure cultural competency training for judicial officers and all court staff.

## **People with Disability or Mental Illness**

- People with cognitive or psychosocial disability are disproportionately represented among both DFV victims and defendants. This includes individuals with acquired brain injury, FASD, and developmental delay.
- As DVConnect has noted, prison is not a rehabilitative environment for individuals with cognitive impairment and can worsen outcomes and recidivism risk.

### **Recommendations:**

- Introduce mandatory disability screening and support referrals pre-sentencing.
- Create and fund disability-informed diversionary programs and specialist courts.
- Increase access to communication aids and support decision-making in court processes.

## **LGBTQIA+ People**

- LGBTQIA+ people experience DFV at similar or higher rates than heterosexual/cisgender populations but face greater barriers to accessing support, including fear of discrimination or outing.
- Police and courts may fail to recognise coercive control and non-physical abuse in same-sex relationships or misinterpret protective actions as aggression.

### **Recommendations:**

- Invest in specialist LGBTQIA+ DFV services and legal advocacy.
- Embed inclusive training for judicial officers and law enforcement on queer relationships and abuse dynamics.

## **People from Other Marginalised and Vulnerable Groups**

This includes people:

- experiencing homelessness or poverty,
- with histories of incarceration or child protection involvement,
- with substance dependence,
- on temporary visas or without citizenship.

Punitive responses often exacerbate existing marginalisation. For example, a short custodial sentence for breaching a DVO may result in loss of housing, employment, and child custody, which can compound risks of future harm and reoffending.

### **Recommendations:**

- Implement whole-of-government support to address the social determinants of DFV, including housing, income, and trauma support.
- Prioritise community-based, therapeutic sentencing options that reflect lived experience and reduce contact with the criminal legal system.

## **5. Anomalies and Complexities Affecting Sentencing of Domestic Violence Offences**

A number of legal and systemic anomalies currently impede the consistent, transparent, and effective sentencing of domestic violence (DV) offences in Queensland. These inconsistencies affect both how seriously courts can treat DV behaviour and how sentencing outcomes are interpreted, potentially undermining the intent of recent legislative reforms and eroding public confidence in the system.

One of the most significant anomalies arises from the jurisdictional divide between Commonwealth and Queensland criminal laws. The current framework means:

- Domestic violence as an aggravating factor (under s 9(10A) PSA) does not apply to Commonwealth offences, such as:
  - *Using a carriage service to menace, harass or offend* (s 474.17 Criminal Code (Cth))
  - *Using a carriage service to make a threat* (s 474.15)
  - *Aggravated carriage service offences involving private sexual material* (s 474.17A)
- Even if such conduct is clearly domestic violence-related, it may not be treated as more serious at sentencing or considered as part of an offender’s DV history for the purposes of aggravation or pattern recognition.

***Example:***

A person may have repeatedly threatened or harassed their partner online or via phone (a pattern of coercive control), yet these actions, if prosecuted under Commonwealth law, cannot trigger the aggravated penalty regime under the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*.

***Implications:***

- This inhibits proper recognition of coercive control, a key risk factor in domestic homicide.
- It creates inequity in sentencing outcomes based solely on whether the prosecution chose to proceed under state or federal law.

***Recommendations:***

- Amend the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 (Qld)* or relevant Commonwealth legislation to allow domestic violence context to be recognised as an aggravating factor, regardless of jurisdiction.
- Introduce a mechanism in criminal history reports to flag prior Commonwealth offences committed in a domestic violence context.
- Improve inter-agency data sharing between police, courts, and the Commonwealth DPP to ensure courts receive accurate and complete histories.

**Criminal Histories and Pattern Recognition**

- Current limitations in court access to contextualised criminal histories can lead to underappreciation of patterns of coercive control and repeat offending.
- Commonwealth offences do not indicate whether they were DV-related, unlike state charges where a DVO or flag may be applied.

***Recommendations:***

- Introduce a domestic violence flagging system for Commonwealth charges and convictions, or an addendum system enabling police to annotate DV context.

- Encourage courts to consider uncharged acts of domestic abuse or history as part of sentencing (where procedural fairness allows), particularly for coercive patterns.
- Time spent in pre-sentence custody is often not declared on the sentencing record, creating public confusion about the actual time served.
- Victims may believe offenders received a lenient sentence when, in reality, time served in remand was accounted for but not made transparent.

***Recommendations:***

- Mandate that all pre-sentence custody must be formally declared and recorded as time served or credited and transparently noted in sentencing remarks.
- Courts should be encouraged to explain how time served has been factored in to ensure confidence in sentencing decisions.

**Misidentification and Gender Bias in Enforcement**

- A complex and highly damaging anomaly is the frequent misidentification of victim-survivors as perpetrators, especially among:
  - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women
  - Women with cognitive disabilities
  - Victims of coercive control who retaliate in self-defence
- Police and courts may fail to identify the primary aggressor, leading to inappropriate applications for DVOs or criminal charges that distort sentencing and criminal histories.

***Recommendations:***

- Establish guidelines and mandatory training for police and prosecutors on identifying the primary aggressor.
- Ensure courts are empowered to receive contextual expert evidence about coercive control, trauma responses, and cultural dynamics to correct potential misidentification before sentencing.

**Lack of Clear Public Understanding of Sentencing Outcomes**

- Community expectations around domestic violence sentencing are frequently at odds with judicial practice, in part due to:
  - Legal complexity
  - Inconsistent public reporting
  - Insufficient judicial commentary on reasoning for decisions

### ***Recommendations:***

- Enhance plain-language explanations in sentencing remarks about factors considered, particularly in DV cases.
- Encourage judicial summaries or press releases (as used in coronial or High Court decisions) for significant DV sentencing decisions to improve transparency and public trust.

### **6. Other Issues Relevant to this Review**

While punitive measures may be necessary for serious or repeated domestic violence offending, there is growing recognition across sentencing councils and academic literature that punishment alone is insufficient to disrupt entrenched patterns of coercive and controlling behaviour. This is especially true where domestic violence is linked to intergenerational trauma, mental illness, substance dependence, or cognitive disability.

- As the NSW and Tasmanian Sentencing Councils have both observed, addressing criminogenic needs and the causes of domestic and family violence (DFV) requires a shift toward therapeutic jurisprudence and evidence-based rehabilitation.
- Many protective parents and victim-survivors do not necessarily want harsh carceral outcomes for the people using violence but rather want the violence to stop and safety restored—a goal rehabilitation is more likely to achieve than incarceration alone.

### ***Recommendation:***

Introduce or expand specialist domestic violence courts or problem-solving courts that include:

- Judicial monitoring
- Mandated participation in culturally safe, trauma-informed perpetrator programs
- Wraparound services addressing drug and alcohol use, housing instability, and mental health.

### **Lack of Nationally Consistent Standards for Domestic Violence Rehabilitation Programs**

Currently, perpetrator intervention programs vary in quality, accessibility, and evidence basis across jurisdictions. Many are not equipped to address:

- High-risk coercive controllers
- Men with cognitive disabilities or mental illness
- Culturally diverse or First Nations participants

Victim-survivors also express concern about the lack of accountability or transparency regarding program compliance and whether the programs are effective.

***Recommendation:***

- Advocate for the development of national minimum standards and accreditation processes for domestic violence perpetrator programs.
- Link sentencing conditions and community corrections orders to participation in quality-assured programs, with judicial monitoring and victim feedback incorporated into progress reviews.

**Misuse of Protection Orders and Systemic Misidentification**

As widely acknowledged in submissions to inquiries such as the *Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce* and the *NSW Domestic Violence Death Review Team*, there are increasing concerns about the weaponisation of protection orders, especially in:

- Family law disputes
- Situations involving counter-allegations
- Cases where primary victims (especially women) are misidentified as perpetrators

This has profound implications for sentencing, particularly when:

- A victim-survivor is convicted of breaching an DVO they should not have been subject to in the first place.
- Prior convictions affect aggravation, bail, or future risk assessments.

**Recommendation:**

- Review sentencing data with a focus on misidentification and wrongful convictions.
- Introduce clear statutory guidance for police and courts about how to handle DVO breaches when primary aggressor identification is disputed.

**Data and Evidence Gaps**

As QSAC itself notes, many disadvantaged groups remain invisible in sentencing data due to inadequate or inconsistent data collection. This includes:

- LGBTQIA+ people
- People with disabilities
- Refugees and migrants
- Children and adolescents exposed to DFV

This undermines the ability to measure the full impact of sentencing reforms and improve equity.

**Recommendation:**

- Improve sentencing and corrections data disaggregation by incorporating fields for disability, sexual orientation, cultural background, and intersectional factors.
- Collaborate with agencies like the AIHW and ANROWS to ensure sentencing outcomes are linked to broader datasets on DFV risk, victim safety, and program efficacy.

**Improving System Coordination Between Family Law, Criminal Law, and Civil DVO Systems**

A significant systemic issue impacting sentencing outcomes is the siloed nature of the family law, criminal law, and civil domestic violence systems. Courts often:

- Lack access to concurrent family law proceedings or parenting orders
- Fail to see the full picture of risk, especially where allegations of child abuse or coercive control are raised
- Risk sentencing based on incomplete or conflicting information

This disconnect can lead to unsafe sentencing decisions, particularly where family law findings contradict criminal court assumptions or when DVOs are used manipulatively in family disputes.

**Recommendation:**

- Create integrated data-sharing protocols between courts, police, and child protection agencies.
- Where feasible, establish multi-jurisdictional coordination frameworks to ensure sentencing decisions are informed by all available information.

**Investment in Prevention and Early Intervention**

Finally, no sentencing reform can operate effectively without addressing the front-end causes of domestic violence. Research and coronial inquests including those into the deaths of Hannah Clarke and her children, and Jack and Jennifer Edwards consistently call for:

- Earlier recognition of coercive control
- Better police and judicial training
- Systems that intervene before violence escalates to lethality

**Conclusion**

In light of the systemic issues discussed throughout this submission, Queensland is uniquely positioned to lead reforms that move beyond punitive sentencing and toward trauma-informed, therapeutic, and equitable approaches to addressing domestic and family violence (DFV). To achieve this, any sentencing framework must:

- Address structural inequality and systemic bias, particularly impacting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, women, LGBTQIA+ people, people with disability, and other marginalised groups;
- Improve coordination between the criminal, civil (DVO), and family law jurisdictions, ensuring that courts make decisions based on the full pattern of risk and not in isolation;
- Eliminate the misidentification of victim-survivors as respondents or offenders, particularly in cases of coercive control and retaliatory violence;
- Centre victim safety and accountability, not merely punishment;
- Invest in rehabilitative sentencing options, including court-monitored therapeutic interventions, that address root causes of DFV and deliver long-term behaviour change;
- Improve data collection and reporting, especially for vulnerable populations currently excluded from sentencing data sets.

Further, this submission urges the Council to recommend legislative reform to prohibit the use of “good character” references in sentencing for sexual offences, including rape and sexual assault. The continued admissibility of such references allows perpetrators to benefit from social status, privilege, or community standing, which often silences victims, reinforces rape myths, and contributes to systemic disbelief of sexual violence disclosures. This concern has been widely acknowledged, including by the Australian Law Reform Commission, and must now be acted upon to ensure a survivor-centred justice system.

This recommendation aligns with the findings of several key inquiries, including:

- The inquest into the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children, which identified systemic failures in recognising coercive control and recommended legislative reform to criminalise it and improve risk assessment and responses across police, legal, and social service systems;
- The NSW State Coroner’s findings in the inquests into the deaths of Jack and Jennifer Edwards, which found critical lapses in information sharing, police responses, and the impact of family law proceedings on protective parents;
- Research cited by the NSW and Tasmanian Sentencing Councils, highlighting the limitations of punishment alone and supporting the development of court-integrated therapeutic and monitoring interventions.

If Queensland is to lead the nation in safety, equity, and justice for survivors of DFV and sexual violence, these reforms are not only necessary, evidence shows they are urgently needed.

Yours sincerely,



Melissa Halliday

