

Murder, Attempted Murder **And Attempt to Procure Another to Murder**

ss 279, 283 and 556 Criminal Code and repealed murder provisions

From 1 January 2014

Transitional Sentencing Provisions: The table is divided into two relevant periods of Sentencing Provisions:

- Post homicide amendments (post 1/08/08)
- Pre homicide amendments (pre 1/08/08)

Glossary:

conc	concurrent
cum	cumulative
EFP	eligible for parole
imp	imprisonment
PG	plea of guilty
TES	total effective sentence
VRO	violence restraining order
Min	minimum
AOBH	assault occasioning bodily harm
TOI	trial of issues
Dep lib	deprivation of liberty

No	Case	Antecedents	Summary/Facts	Sentence	Appeal
26.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Clark</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 103</p> <p>Delivered 25/06/2020</p>	<p>31 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; including a conviction for domestic violence relating offending on C.</p> <p>Difficult and problematic childhood.</p> <p>Diagnosed with ADD as a child; suffers from epilepsy; poor decision making and coping skills.</p> <p>History of substance abuse since the age of 18 yrs.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg (dwelling). Ct 2: Att murder.</p> <p>Clark and C (victim ct 1), separated after a relationship of about 10 yrs. They had four children together.</p> <p>Clark moved out of the family home. Despite C allowing him to visit and stay at the house from time to time, he knew the home was solely the place of C and the children.</p> <p>Clark had trouble accepting the relationship was over. On an occasion in the weeks before the offending he believed, incorrectly, C was seeing another man. He went to the house in the early hrs of the morning, resulting in a verbal confrontation with C.</p> <p>The night before the offending Clark was again preoccupied with the thought that C was involved with other men. Agitated and angry he fabricated a reason to go to her home. He sent false text messages to and from his mobile telephone to create an apparent conversation between himself and a fictitious buyer about the sale of a bicycle. He then tried contacting C about the fictitious sale.</p> <p>That evening Mr L (victim ct 2) spent the night at C's home. In the morning Clark went to the house, not knowing Mr L or anyone else apart from C would be home.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 15 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 15 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the respondent's attack was premediated; he entered the bedroom with the intention of killing the victim; the intention to kill was not held only momentarily and it was not an act in self-defence; the victim was defenceless and he attacked with dangerous weapons; it was persistent and violent and inflicted very serious facial injury which left the victim with a permanent facial disfigurement.</p> <p>The trial judge found the respondent fled the scene and rendered no assistance to the victim, despite it being obvious</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence ct 2.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 17 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 17 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [70] ... the respondent's offending was a serious example of offending of its type. The respondent's attack on [Mr L] was premediated. The attack was carried out with weapons. The respondent's intention to kill was not held only momentarily. He held that intention while he was inflicting the injuries. The respondent's attack on [Mr L] was persistent. After attacking [Mr L], the respondent fled the scene and rendered no assistance to him.</p>

			<p>Without consent Clark entered C's house. He asked C to give their relationship another chance, but she told him she was not interested and that she had spent the night with someone else.</p> <p>Clark then went into C's bedroom and there was a brief verbal exchange with Mr L. Clark collected a knife from the kitchen and tried to return to the bedroom, but was prevented from doing so by C. He eventually threw the knife across the room before leaving the house.</p> <p>That same day Clark repeatedly tried to contact C, before returning to the house. C refused to let him enter her home or to discuss their relationship. As she opened the door he pushed past her and entered the house. At some point he took a Stanley knife, with the blade extended, from his pocket. He told C, 'I'm going to slice this cunt up' and then walked towards the bedroom where Mr L was lying on the bed. C telephoned 000.</p> <p>Clark told Mr L he was going to kill him, before punching him in the mouth. He then slashed Mr L across the face with the knife, causing a deep laceration to his cheek, which bled profusely.</p> <p>Clark continued the attack on Mr L by jumping on him, sitting on his chest and slashing him with the knife. He suffered cuts to his arms and hands as he att to defend himself and a number</p>	<p>he had suffered injury.</p> <p>No acceptance of responsibility; blamed the victim for his offending; limited remorse and limited victim empathy; responded positively to incarceration.</p> <p>Medium risk of future violent offending.</p>	<p>At [77] In our opinion, the sentence ... was not commensurate with the seriousness of the respondent's offending. The sentence ... was not merely lenient. In particular, the sentence was not merely at or towards the lower end of the sentencing outcome open to his Honour on a proper exercise of his discretion. The sentence was substantially less than the sentencing outcome that was properly open to his Honour.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

			<p>of large cuts to his body.</p> <p>When Mr L fell to the floor Clark got on top of him, repeatedly telling him he was going to kill him. During a struggle for control of the knife, the knife's blade was ejected.</p> <p>Clark collected two more knives from the kitchen, along with a screwdriver. Returning to the bedroom he continued his attack on Mr L, slashing and stabbing him with one of the knives and the screwdriver.</p> <p>Clark left the house. He was arrested a short time later.</p> <p>If not treated the deep cut to Mr L's cheek would have endangered or been likely to have endangered his life.</p>		
25.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Attwood</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 49</p> <p>Delivered 09/04/2020</p> <p>Co offender:</p>	<p><u>Attwood</u> 35 yrs at time offending. 37 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>No prior criminal history.</p> <p>Dysfunctional childhood; witnessed and subjected to domestic violence, intimidation, manipulation and child abuse; frequent run away; unsuccessful foster placements; commenced living independently young age.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The victim, Mr Taylor was aged 42 yrs. He and Attwood were in a relationship and lived together with their young son.</p> <p>Also living at the house was Edhouse and DG, a juvenile. Mr Dymock previously lived at the premises, but had recently moved out to live with his girlfriend, Ms Dunn.</p> <p>Attwood, Edhouse and Mr Dymock were members of a white supremacist group the 'Aryan Nations'.</p>	<p>Life imp, min non-parole period of 21 yrs imp.</p> <p>The trial judge found the offending was aggravated as Attwood and Edhouse intended to kill the victim; it was premeditated and planned; there were base motives for the murder; a weapon was used; the viciousness in the manner in which the</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of min non-parole period.</p> <p>At [71] ... Mr Taylor's murder was a very serious example of offending of the kind in question. The very serious character of the offence committed ... is readily apparent from the aggravating factors enumerated by the trial judge Her Honour made</p>

<p><i>Dymock v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 213</p> <p>Delivered 15/01/2020</p>	<p>Completed yr 9 schooling; no qualifications.</p> <p>Employed child and aged care until work related injury; disability support pension from aged 21 yrs.</p> <p>Denied illicit drug use; positive tests for cannabis and unprescribed prescription medication in custody.</p> <p>In 'fair' health; adrenal tumour and lower back pain.</p> <p><u>Edhouse</u> 20 yrs at time offending. 22 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior NSW criminal history; convictions for AOBH; stalking.</p> <p>Dysfunctional upbringing; 8 mths old when mother disappeared; father, associated with outlaw motorcycle gang, in custody at time; cared for by family until father's release.</p> <p>Father remains supportive.</p>	<p>Edhouse and Attwood were in a sexual relationship. They decided to murder Mr Taylor and discussed methods of killing him with DG. They offered DG money to assist in the murder.</p> <p>One morning Attwood and Edhouse drove to Mr Dymock's home, where they collected him and DG. All four then travelled to Attwood and Mr Taylor's property. At some point Edhouse and DG attacked Mr Taylor as he lay asleep or dozing in his bed. Each struck him on the head multiple times with a hammer.</p> <p>Mr Dymock was outside whilst the fatal attack occurred. He did not participate in the attack or aid in the murder.</p> <p>They placed their bloodstained clothing into a bag. Attwood then attempted to make it look as though the house had been burgled.</p> <p>In order to establish an alibi for themselves the four then drove to a local cinema and watched a movie. During which Mr Dymock and DG left to purchase deodorant to cover up the smell of blood and their body odour.</p> <p>After the movie they showered at Mr Dymock's apartment. They also told Dunn they had murdered Mr Taylor.</p> <p>Plastic bags containing incriminating evidence were removed from Mr Dymock's apartment, they have never been located.</p>	<p>victim was killed; his numerous severe injuries; it deprived a young child of his father and, indirectly, his mother; it was committed in company and took advantage of the trust in which the victim had placed in each of them; he was attacked when vulnerable and was left severely injured and dying, naked and alone on the floor; they attempted to cover up the murder and lied and destroyed evidence.</p> <p>The trial judge found Edhouse played a greater role in the commission of the offence; whilst Attwood had more to gain and played a greater role in covering up the murder.</p> <p>Profound and significant effect of the victim's son, extended family, friends and associates.</p>	<p>an unchallenged finding that each of Ms Attwood and Mr Edhouse were equally culpable.</p> <p>At [73] The min non-parole periods ... were at or very close to the lower end of the sentencing outcomes open to her Honour on a proper exercise of her discretion. It was open to have imposed distinctly longer min non-parole periods. However, bearing in mind the principles set out at [65] and [66] ..., the min non-parole periods are broadly consistent with the min non-parole periods imposed in reasonably comparable cases. ... We are not persuaded, ... this court's intervention is necessary to confirm the sentencing principles applicable to offending of this kind or to maintain proper sentencing standards with respect to such offending; or ... the min non-parole periods are unreasonable or plainly unjust.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Conflict at school with students and teachers; time at boarding school; completed yr 10; no qualifications.</p> <p>Employed abattoir work and number of unskilled occupations.</p> <p>History of substance abuse; commenced cannabis use aged 16 yrs; alcohol use aged 17 yrs and regular use of cocaine; binge drinking and daily use of cannabis at time offending,</p> <p>Good physical health; history of attempts at self-harm; diagnosed with anxiety and depressive disorder.</p>	<p>Attwood then return home alone and called 000 in order to support her false story that Mr Taylor was at home, alive and uninjured when she left.</p> <p>Paramedics attended and found Mr Taylor deceased.</p> <p>It is believed Mr Taylor was alive but unconscious for between two to five hrs after the attack.</p>	<p><u>Attwood</u> Model prisoner; undertaking studies in custody.</p> <p>Lower risk of future violence and future offending than Edhouse.</p> <p><u>Edhouse</u> Moderate risk of future violent offending.</p>	
24.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Radovic</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 46</p> <p>Delivered 08/04/2020</p>	<p>45 yrs at time offending. 47 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (ct 1) (15% discount). Convicted after trial (ct 2).</p> <p>Significant prior criminal history; including offending against police officers; one involving the brandishing of the same samurai sword in a threatening and menacing</p>	<p>Ct 1: Armed likely to cause fear. Ct 2: Att murder.</p> <p>Radovic and his wife, Ms Radovic, were separated. She had obtained a VRO against him, preventing him from contacting or communicating with her or their children.</p> <p>Ms Radovic opposed an application by Radovic to vary the terms of the VRO. This upset and angered him.</p> <p>The following day Radovic, armed with a</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 9 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 9 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the offending on ct 2 'towards the upper end of the scale of seriousness' for offences of this nature.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence (ct 2).</p> <p>No challenge to sentence imposed on ct 1.</p> <p>Re-sentenced: Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 13 yrs imp (conc).</p>

		<p>manner as police were endeavouring to arrest him.</p> <p>Unremarkable childhood.</p> <p>Completed high school; 12 mths studying civil engineering; qualified boilermaker.</p> <p>Talented sportsman; represented the State in karate and the country in boxing.</p> <p>Married; relationship ended after 24 yrs; three children aged 15, 17 and 20 yrs.</p> <p>Ceased working after the breakdown of his marriage; in receipt of unemployment benefits; working intermittently as a labourer.</p> <p>Emotionally impacted by the death of his brother to suicide and his father's death in 2002.</p> <p>Good physical health; history of mental health issues (depression and anxiety).</p> <p>Past illicit drug use; inconsistent accounts given of the nature and extent of his substance abuse.</p>	<p>samurai sword, attended the workplace of his former brother-in-law, Mr P. He left on finding Mr P was not there. That same afternoon he went to Mr P's home, knowing he lived there with Ms Radovic's sister. He banged on the door and shouted aggressively, 'I will fucking kill you'se all'. He then left the unit.</p> <p>Radovic, unaware that Ms Radovic and his children lived in a unit in front and to the side of her sister's unit, was seen by one of his sons. His son called his mother, who in turn called the police. Snr Const Swift and another officer attended the premises. A number of other people, including Ms Radovic also arrived at the home.</p> <p>The police and others were still at the unit when Radovic drove back to the premises and pulled into the driveway. He was armed with the samurai sword. Someone tried to hold his car door closed, but he produced the sword and was able to exit his vehicle. In a rage he brandished the sword in a manner that caused fear to those present and said words to the effect of, 'I'm going to kill you all' and 'I want to die'.</p> <p>The two officers, alerted to Radovic's attendance, came outside. He raised the sword above his head and moved towards Snr Const Swift. With his taser drawn Snr Const Swift shouted at him to stop. He ignored this command and rushed towards the officer with the sword, prompting Snr Const Swift to</p>	<p>The trial judge found the offending was agg by the victim being a police officer carrying out his duty in protection of the community; the nature of the weapon used; the blow was aimed at the victim's head, a vulnerable area with a high potential for fatal injury; his continued behaviour of aggressively resisting the officers; he was the subject of a VRO at the time of the offending.</p> <p>The trial judge found that the respondent struck the officer to the head with the intention of killing him; he had brought the sword with him to cause fear to those he intended to confront and that he was prepared to use the sword to cause physical harm during this confrontation.</p> <p>The trial judge rejected</p>	<p>EFP.</p> <p>At [62] ... the respondent's offending, the subject of ct 2, was a very serious example of offending of the kind in question. The very serious nature of the offending is readily apparent from the agg factors specified by the trial judge ... The respondent inflicted grievous injuries upon Senior Constable Swift who was, at the material time, acting courageously in the discharge of his public duties. The respondent ignored Senior Constable Swift's direction to cease approaching him and his fellow officer. The respondent had the capacity to carry out his intention of killing Senior Constable Swift. It is fortuitous that Senior Constable Swift did not suffer fatal injuries. ...</p> <p>At [63] Police officers are often required to place their safety at risk in carrying out their duty to protect the</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

			<p>discharge his Taser, to no effect. Radovic swung the sword in a forceful downward motion, striking the top of Snr Const Swift's unprotected head.</p> <p>Snr Const Swift was able to grab Radovic around the neck and wrestle him to the ground. He was eventually tasered and subdued.</p> <p>Snr Const Swift was conveyed to hospital. The blow caused a large gash to the top of his head and a fractured skull. He also suffered a laceration to his forehead.</p>	<p>the assertion that the respondent did not realise Senior Constable Swift was a police officer until after he struck him.</p> <p>Some late expressions of remorse; no expressions of regret or responsibility; characterised as 'a danger to the community' and 'risk of reoffending obvious'.</p> <p>Traumatic impact on the victim and his family.</p>	<p>public. It is vital that the courts impose significant custodial sentences upon offenders who intentionally cause serious injury to police officers acting the course of their duties. ...</p> <p>At [64] ... The criminality of the respondent's conduct was increased by the fact that he att to murder a police officer who was executing his duties. ...</p>
23.	<p><i>Dymock v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 213</p> <p>Delivered 15/01/2020</p> <p>Co offenders:</p> <p><i>The State of Western</i></p>	<p>19 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial (acquitted of murder).</p>	<p>1 x Accessory after the fact (principal offence murder).</p> <p>The victim, Mr Taylor, lived with his partner and co-accused Ms Attwood. Also living at the house was the co-accused Edhouse and a juvenile, DG.</p> <p>Dymock, Edhouse and Ms Attwood were members of a white supremacist group the 'Aryan Nations'.</p> <p>Edhouse and Ms Attwood were in a sexual relationship. They decided to murder Mr Taylor and discussed methods of killing him with DG. Offering DG money to assist in the murder.</p>	<p>5 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant provided assistance to the co-offenders; he changed his clothing to dispose of evidence that could have connected him with the murder; he accompanied his co-offenders to the cinema to create and maintain a false alibi; he purchased</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned error of fact (alleged acts of assistance for the purposes of being an accessory after the fact to murder).</p> <p>Re-sentenced to 4 yrs imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [88] The trial judge found that, shortly after the fatal assault, the appellant ascertained that Mr Taylor had been fatally injured ...;</p>

<p><i>Australia v Attwood</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 49</p> <p>Delivered 09/04/2020</p>			<p>One morning Edhouse and DG attacked Mr Taylor as he lay in his bed, hitting him on the head multiple times with a hammer. They were knowingly assisted to do so by Attwood.</p> <p>Dymock was at the house but outside when the fatal attack occurred. He did not participate in the attack or aid in the murder and he did not know the assault was going to occur.</p> <p>Ms Attwood attempted to make it look as though the house had been burgled.</p> <p>Dymock then accompanied the co-offenders to a cinema. During a movie Dymock and DG left to purchase deodorant to cover up the smell of blood and body odour on the offenders.</p> <p>After the movie the four went to Dymock's apartment, where he allowed the co-offenders to shower and use his home as a refuge. Dymock changed his clothes.</p> <p>Plastic bags containing incriminating evidence were removed from Dymock's apartment, they have never been located.</p> <p>Ms Attwood then return home alone and called 000 in order to support her false story that Mr Taylor was at home, alive and in good health when she left.</p> <p>Paramedics attended and found Mr Taylor</p>	<p>deodorant to cover up the smell; he allowed them to shower and use his home as a refuge after the offence; he disposed of incriminating evidence associated with the murder and he generally supplied moral support to them.</p> <p>The trial judge found that 'shortly after the fatal assault' the appellant learned that Mr Taylor had been 'fatally injured'.</p> <p>The trial judge found the events at the house must have informed the appellant that Mr Taylor had been badly assaulted; that he and others present were doing things to enable the offenders to escape punishment and that Mr Taylor was not expected to survive and no assistance was being obtained for him.</p>	<p>the appellant learned of the assault on Mr Taylor while the appellant was at the ... property ...; the events at the ... property informed the appellant that Mr Taylor had been badly assaulted and that Mr Taylor had been attacked by one or more of Ms Attwood, Mr Edhouse and DG; the appellant knew that he and others present at the ... property were doing things to enable one or more of Ms Attwood, Mr Edhouse and DG to escape punishment; and the appellant was then aware that Mr Taylor was not expected to survive the assault and that no assistance was being obtained for him ...</p> <p>At [90] ... on the trial judge's findings, the appellant had an actual belief, before about 3.40 pm, that Ms Attwood, Mr Edhouse and DG had murdered Mr Taylor. The requirement of 'knowing', within s 10(1), in relation to</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>deceased.</p> <p>Mr Taylor suffered massive head injuries as a result of the assault. It is believed he was alive but unconscious between two to five hrs after the attack.</p> <p>Dymock continued to maintain he had nothing to do with Mr Taylor's death, but he eventually told police that Edhouse and DG had informed him they had beaten the victim to death with a hammer.</p>		<p>the offence of murder was satisfied.</p> <p>At [91] ... for the reasons outlined at [73]-[79] ... her Honour erred in sentencing the appellant on the basis that he had provided assistance to Ms Attwood, M Edhouse and DG to escape punishment before the time (namely about 3.40 pm) when, on the evidence, it was no longer reasonably possible that Mr Taylor was alive.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>22.</p>	<p><i>Birdsall v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 79</p> <p>Delivered 21/05/2019</p>	<p><u>Birdsall</u> 29 yrs at time offending. 30 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Significant prior criminal history; including offences of serious violence.</p> <p>Parents separated when young; little contact with his father; aged 8 yrs when father died; improved relationship with his step-father.</p> <p>Disadvantaged childhood; mother suffered mental health issues; transient lifestyle; placement in foster care; victim of serious criminal offences when young.</p> <p>Treated for depression.</p> <p>Alcohol and illicit drugs use from aged 13 yrs.</p> <p><u>Anthony</u> 19 yrs at time offending. 21 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>There were three altercations between two groups of people. During the third altercation one of the groups consisted of eight males, Birdsall, Anthony, Pickett, Mead and four other males (Birdsall's group). They ranged in age from 11 yrs to 29 yrs.</p> <p>The first two altercations consisted of verbal exchanges and threats with weapons, including a tomahawk; poles, rocks and bottles.</p> <p>The deceased did not know any of the eight males before the night in question.</p> <p>Shortly after the second attack Birdsall's group, carrying various weapons and objects, went in pursuit of the deceased's group. On arriving to where the deceased's group were, the deceased ran. He was pursued, caught and assaulted.</p> <p>The deceased was kicked to the head and other parts of his body and struck with a star picket and a wooden pole. During the course of the attack the accused was stabbed in the chest with a screwdriver, inflicting a 25 cm wound.</p> <p>After this assault the group fled, leaving the deceased dead or dying on the floor.</p> <p>The deceased died very quickly, as a result of the deep penetrating stab wound to the chest.</p>	<p><u>Birdsall</u> Life imp, min non-parole period 18 yrs.</p> <p><u>Anthony</u> Life imp, min non-parole period 16 yrs.</p> <p><u>Pickett</u> Life imp, min non-parole period 16 yrs.</p> <p><u>Mead</u> Life imp, min non-parole period 16 yrs.</p> <p>The trial judge was satisfied the deceased died as a result of a stab wound inflicted by a screwdriver and that moderate to considerable force was required to inflict the fatal injury.</p> <p>The trial judge found during the altercation Birdsall kicked the deceased to the head and other parts of his body; Mead struck the deceased with a metal picket and Anthony</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p><u>Birdsall</u> Appeal concerned length of non-parole period.</p> <p><u>Anthony</u> Appeal concerned parity principle (non-parole period) and length of non-parole period.</p> <p><u>Pickett</u> Appeal concerned parity principle.</p> <p><u>Mead</u> Appeal concerned length of non-parole period.</p> <p><u>Pickett</u> At [315] ... all the offenders were sentenced on the basis of s8 of the Code, namely that each was a party to a common unlawful purpose and, in the prosecution of such purpose, an offence was committed (namely, the murder of the Deceased) of such a nature that its commission was a probable consequence of the</p>
------------	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Prior criminal history; no prior sentences of imp or detention.</p> <p>Disadvantaged and unstable home life; evicted from family home aged 11 yrs; homeless or living in temporary accommodation number of yrs.</p> <p>Suffered tragic death of his father at a young age; unresolved issues over his death; resulting anger and antisocial conduct.</p> <p>Valued employee and 'breadwinner' at time offending.</p> <p>History of illicit drug use.</p> <p><u>Pickett</u> 19 yrs at time offending. 21 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; no prior sentences of imp or detention.</p> <p>Exposed to violence from a young age.</p> <p>Strong family support.</p>		<p>struck him with a wooden pole.</p> <p>The trial judge sentenced the appellants on the basis each was a party to a common unlawful purpose and, in the prosecution of such purpose, an offence was committed, of such a nature that its commission was a probable consequence of the prosecution of that unlawful purpose.</p> <p><u>Birdsall</u> No demonstrated remorse; made some admissions; high risk of future violent offending.</p> <p><u>Anthony</u> Delayed remorse and admissions.</p> <p><u>Pickett</u> Some demonstrated remorse; high risk of reoffending.</p> <p><u>Mead</u> Evinced some remorse</p>	<p>prosecution of such purpose.</p> <p><u>Mead</u> At [350] ... the murder committed by [Mead] and his co-offenders was undoubtedly a serious example of offending of that kind. The Deceased was attacked in company and with some ferocity and persistence.</p> <p>At [353]-[354]... having regard to the objective seriousness of [his] offending and taking into account the significant sentencing factors of appropriate punishment and personal and general deterrence, the min non-parole period imposed ... represented a proper exercise of the sentencing discretion. ... The length of the minimum non-parole period was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p> <p><u>Anthony</u> At [371] ... none of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Limited literacy; limited employment history.</p> <p><u>Mead</u> 19 yrs at time offending. 21yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; including detention for serious violent offence.</p> <p>Large family; exposed to violence, including domestic violence, as a child; witnessed the loss of younger brother at a very young age; which death had a serious impact on him and his family.</p>		<p>for his offending; made some admissions.</p>	<p>offenders was sentenced on the basis that he had stabbed the Deceased with the screwdriver. ...</p> <p>At [374] ... after evaluating and weighing all relevant facts and circumstances and all relevant sentencing factors relating to [Anthony] and his co-offenders, the absence of disparity in the sentencing outcomes did not infringe the parity principle or the principle of equal justice. ...</p> <p><u>Birdsall</u> At [390] ... after evaluating and weighing all relevant facts and circumstances and all relevant sentencing factors relating to [Birdsall] and his co-offenders, the disparity between [his] sentence and the sentences of his co-offenders did not infringe the parity principle or the principle of equal justice. ...</p>
21.	<i>Smith v The State of Western</i>	<p>38 yrs at time offending. 39 yrs at time sentencing.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burglary. Cts 2 & 3: Agg att murder.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 15 yrs imp. Ct 3: 15 yrs imp (to</p>	<p>Dismissed. Appeal concerned errors in</p>

<p>Australia</p> <p>[2019] WASCA 7</p> <p>Delivered 14/01/2019</p>	<p>Convicted after PG (15% discount).</p> <p>No relevant prior criminal history.</p> <p>Difficult childhood; youngest of two children; father violent alcoholic; parents separated when aged 6 yrs; both parents deceased.</p> <p>Supportive family and friends.</p> <p>Left school aged 16 yrs; completed certificate at WA Academy of Performing Arts.</p> <p>Good work ethic; ran own business number of yrs; employed at time offending.</p> <p>Three children with victim TS.</p> <p>At time offending suffering emotional difficulties resulting from death of some close family members.</p> <p>No history of mental ill health.</p>	<p>Smith and the victim TS were married. Their relationship was volatile and he was physically violent towards her. After they separated TS took out a VRO protecting herself from Smith.</p> <p>Smith was not at home when he learnt his children were at his home, having been left there by TS. Angry, he returned home. When his attempts to contact TS were unsuccessful his anger increased.</p> <p>Telling his eldest son he was going to kill his mother and that it was his fault, Smith armed himself with knives and drove to TS's home. He took with him his son's iPad, to prevent him from warning his mother.</p> <p>At the victim's home he looked through a window and saw TS and the victim Mr B in bed. Failing to gain entry to the home through the front and back doors, he smashed a window and entered the bedroom.</p> <p>When confronted by Mr B he struck him in the face and neck with a knife.</p> <p>As TS attempted to flee her home Smith struck her in the neck, body and legs with a knife. When TS managed to struggle into the kitchen he struck her again with the knife.</p> <p>Hearing Mr B calling for help Smith returned to the bedroom and against struck him a number of times with the knife. One blow nearly severed a</p>	<p>commence having served 4 yrs for ct 2).</p> <p>TES 19 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offences of att murder were at the upper end of the scale of seriousness for this kind of offence.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant carried out the attacks in a relatively calm and chillingly determined fashion; the circumstances of the offending demonstrated a desire on his part for retribution and involved a merciless attack on the victims; using knives not only to cause injury, but also terror to the victims.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the attack on the victim TS had some degree of premeditation</p>	<p>law (legislative minimum sentence and failure to give reasons for not imposing life imp cts 2 & 3) and length of sentence (cts 2 & 3).</p> <p>At [65] ... her Honour did not err in law by deciding that the offence of agg att murder is subject to a 'legislative requirement for a minimum sentence of imp of 15 yrs'. ... the statutory penalty and, also, the maximum penalty for the offence of agg att murder is life imp and the minimum penalty for that offence is 15 yrs imp. ...</p> <p>At [66] ... Her Honour was not obliged, ... to give more detailed or elaborate reasons for imposing the minimum penalty and not the maximum penalty. ...</p> <p>At [73] ... There is no foundation in counsel for the appellant's submissions or in the other material before the court on which to construct a reasonable</p>
--	---	--	---	---

			<p>finger, another caused a deep laceration to his face and a further blow severed the carotid artery in his neck.</p> <p>Smith then realised TS had fled the home. Still armed with the knife he followed the trail of her blood and located her. He then used the knife to sever her right breast, exposing the implant inside.</p> <p>Both victims were flown to hospital and treated for deep, life threatening lacerations.</p>	<p>or planning; he had armed himself with weapons; the offences were committed in breach of a VRO and at night when the victims were sleeping and more vulnerable and incapable of properly defending themselves; he inflicted numerous knife wounds over a relatively prolonged period and the wounds inflicted on TS were intended to mutilate her; despite it being obvious he had inflicted serious injuries and despite their pleas for assistance at no stage did the appellant stop or display any concern for the victims welfare; he pursued TS when she sought refuge with a neighbour and inflicted further knife wounds when the neighbour and her children were inside their home.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant's</p>	<p>argument that the discount of 15% was unreasonable or plainly unjust.</p> <p>At [76] The sentencing judge expressly took into account, ... that at the time of the offending the appellant was suffering some emotional difficulty consequent upon the death of some close family members.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>behaviour towards his son 'particularly cruel, deplorable and heartless' causing him considerable trauma.</p> <p>Enormous effect on the victim TS and her children.</p> <p>Some demonstrated remorse; cooperative with police.</p>	
20.	<p><i>Ruthsalz v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA 178</p> <p>Delivered 12/10/2018</p>	<p><u>J Ruthsalz</u> 43 yrs at time offending. 45 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history.</p> <p><u>S Ruthsalz</u> 25 yrs at time offending. 26 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history, no prior convictions involving violence.</p> <p>Childhood marred by father's drug and alcohol abuse and extreme violence perpetrated towards her mother; experienced</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>S Ruthsalz was in a relationship with the victim and they had a young child together. There was tension in the relationship and a major source of dispute between them was her mother, J Ruthsalz.</p> <p>J Ruthsalz was friends with J Campbell and her husband D Campbell (co-offender). She told J Campbell that the victim was physically and verbally abusive to her daughter. After visiting the couple's home J Campbell got the impression the victim did not like her and this reinforced her negative view of him and that S Ruthsalz was 'at risk'.</p> <p>At some point there was discussion between J Ruthsalz, her partner and J Campbell that something needed to be done and the victim needed to be killed and it made to look like a</p>	<p><u>J Ruthsalz</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 24 yrs imp.</p> <p><u>S Ruthsalz</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 21 yrs imp.</p> <p><u>D Newton</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 24 yrs imp.</p> <p><u>J Campbell</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 13 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p><u>J Ruthsalz</u> Appeal concerned length of sentence (non-parole period) and errors of finding (involved in a very serious category of murder; aggravating factor not relevant to criminality and intended victim would be killed).</p> <p><u>S Ruthsalz</u> Appeal concerned length of sentence (non-parole period) and errors of finding (involved in a very serious category of murder and aggravating factor not relevant to criminality).</p>

		<p>poverty, instability and general neglect; bullied and suffered social isolation at school.</p> <p>Employed customer service jobs.</p> <p><u>D Newton</u> 47 yrs at time offending. 49 yrs at time sentencing</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; no prior violent offending.</p> <p>Married; three children.</p> <p><u>J Campbell</u> 44 yrs at time offending. 46 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG.</p> <p>Victim of domestic abuse by former partner; suffered trauma and long-term effects to mental health, indications of PTSD.</p>	<p>carjacking.</p> <p>Later J Campbell suggested to D Newton that the victim needed ‘a touch along’, ‘a kick in the head’, or ‘a broken arm or leg’ to knock some sense into him. D Newton agreed to assist.</p> <p>There were numerous conversations were J Ruthsalz would ask J Campbell if she could assist with having the victim killed. J Ruthsalz pressured her to assist by telling her the victim was now abusing his young daughter.</p> <p>A plan was formed. S Ruthsalz provided information to D Campbell and D Newton to enable them to identify the victim. Both also travelled to the victim’s address to familiarise themselves with the house and its surroundings in preparation for the intended killing.</p> <p>Two days later, S Ruthsalz, with their daughter, went to her mother’s, leaving the victim at home alone. She later sent the victim text messages falsely purporting to be elsewhere, in order to explain why she had not returned home and to ensure he remained at home. She also provided the keys to her home, to enable D Campbell and D Newton access and to surprise the victim.</p> <p>D Campbell and D Newton, most likely armed, travelled together to the victim’s home, stopping to purchase a container of petrol on the way. On arrival they attacked the victim, causing him severe injury. He was then forced or carried into</p>	<p>found the offending was in a ‘very serious category of murder’; it was planned and premediated; the victim was killed with extreme brutality in his home, a place where he was entitled to feel safe; there was nothing by way of provocation; he was outnumbered; his attackers were armed and efforts were made to conceal the crime and deceive police.</p> <p><u>J Ruthsalz</u> The trial judge found the appellant ‘the primary instigator’ in the plan to kill the victim.</p> <p>The trial judge did not accept the appellant merely wanted the victim to be assaulted; she played a coordinated role; she wanted ‘a more permanent solution and she pressed hard for it’ and she sought to ensure there was distance between her and those</p>	<p><u>D Newton</u> Appeal concerned length of sentence (non-parole period) and error of finding (involvement and culpability).</p> <p><u>J Campbell</u> Appeal concerned miscarriage in sentencing (failure to take into account PG and cooperation with authorities).</p> <p><u>J Ruthsalz</u> At [294] ... there was a proper basis in the evidence for the trial judge’s finding that [her] role included being the primary (not the only) instigator of the plan to kill</p> <p>At [303] ... there was a proper basis in the evidence ... for his Honour’s finding that [she] intended to kill</p> <p>At [315] ... the murder ... was a very serious example of offending of that kind. The very serious nature of</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>the boot of his car.</p> <p>The victim's car was driven to vacant land and, using the petrol purchased earlier, set on fire.</p> <p>Attending firefighters discovered the victim's body in the boot. Post-mortem examination revealed the cause of death to be smoke inhalation with incineration.</p>	<p>carrying out the killing, including obtaining a mobile phone subscribed in a false name.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant may not have known the manner in which the killing was to be affected, but she knew and intended he would be killed and intended by her acts to assist in the killing.</p> <p><u>S Ruthsalz</u> The trial judge found the appellant was drawn into the plan instigated by her mother and J Campbell; she played a lesser role in the offending; she arranged for the victim to be at home; to keep him at home; handed over the keys to facilitate the attack upon him and she knew he would be killed when she left the home the night of the offence.</p> <p><u>D Newton</u></p>	<p>the offending is reflected in the aggravating factors specified by his Honour ... [she] was the primary instigator of the plan to kill She played a coordinating role and intended that he would be killed.</p> <p>At [317] ... the objective seriousness of [her] offending, and the importance of appropriate punishment and general deterrence as sentencing factors, precluded the imposition of a lesser non-parole period.</p> <p><u>S Ruthsalz</u> At [338] ... [she] played a significant role in effectuating [the victim's] killing. Her role was not merely passive. She formed an intention to kill. ...</p> <p>At [341] ... the objective seriousness of [her] offending, and the importance of appropriate punishment and general deterrence as sentencing</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>The trial judge found the appellant's role was to carry out the killing with D Campbell; it was premeditated murder; the offence was carefully planned and executed; his involvement chilling in that he killed a man he did not know for no other reason than to assist a friend.</p> <p>The trial judge found that while it was not possible to determine whether the appellant or D Campbell inflicted the injuries to the victim and who lit the fire he was satisfied they acted together and were equally responsible for them.</p> <p><u>J Campbell</u> The trial judge found the appellant played a pivotal role in the offending and acted as the go-between, recruited D Newton and, although the plan was not initially to kill, she</p>	<p>factors, precluded the imposition of a lesser min non-parole period.</p> <p><u>D Newton</u> At [365] ... it was open to the trial judge, ... to be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that [he] had participated in the assault of [the victim] ... as the judge found and was entitled to find, [the victim] was surprised while alone in his house at night; blunt force was used against him; and the blood spatter in the house was consistent with [the victim] having suffered significant impact injuries and a major bloodletting event.</p> <p>At [382] ... the objective seriousness of [his] offending, and the importance of appropriate punishment and general deterrence as sentencing factors, precluded the imposition of a lesser min non-parole period.</p> <p><u>J Campbell</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>accepted that that became the plan and, accordingly, she intended that the victim would be killed.</p> <p>Co-operative with police and 'significant' assistance provided as witness for the State.</p>	<p>At [403] ... the facts and circumstances of [the victim's] murder (including the planned and premeditated nature of the killing) and [her] pivotal role in the offending were such that it was not 'clearly unjust' for the trial judge to impose a sentence of life imp, notwithstanding the significant mitigating factors, including her PG and cooperation.</p>
19.	<p><i>Mansfield v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 178</p> <p>Delivered 29/09/2017</p> <p>Co-offender of:</p> <p><i>Marchesano v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 177</p>	<p>33 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history, including offences of violence.</p> <p>Illicit drug user.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant and the co-offender Marchesano agreed to kill the deceased.</p> <p>The appellant and Marchesano took possession of a rifle. Later that same day Marchesano went with the deceased, in the deceased's car, to an isolated bush area on the pretext of collecting some stolen items.</p> <p>Marchesano was aware the appellant was already at the location, waiting with the loaded rifle. When they arrived the appellant shot the deceased once in the head, killing him.</p> <p>The appellant and Marchesano dumped the deceased's body in bushland several km from the site where the killing occurred. They then burnt their clothes and the wooden portions of</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period 26 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending aggravated by its planning; it was unprovoked; the deceased was lured to a location where he was vulnerable and his body hidden and dealt with in a disrespectful manner.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant 'in charge' of hiding or destroying evidence and burying the deceased's</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appellant challenged length of sentence (non-parole period).</p> <p>At [222] ... The min term is not materially inconsistent with min terms previously imposed for reasonably comparable offending or for offending of a greater degree of seriousness than the appellant's.</p> <p>At [223] ... the murder committed by the appellant was a very serious example of offending of that kind.</p>

			<p>the rifle, disposed of the remaining firearm parts and cleaned the deceased's car.</p> <p>About a week later the two, together with a third person, moved the deceased's body to another location, where it was burnt and buried in a clandestine bush grave. They also set fire to the deceased's car.</p>	<p>body.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant without remorse.</p> <p>Steps taken towards rehabilitation while in custody.</p>	<p>The appellant joined with Mr Marchesano in a plan to kill him. The killing was unprovoked. The appellant actually shot and killed the deceased. Later, the appellant participated in hiding or destroying evidence, and dismembering, burning and disposing of the deceased's body, for the purpose of endeavouring to avoid detection.</p> <p>At [225] ... The length of the min non-parole period was not unreasonable or plainly unjust.</p>
18.	<p><i>Marchesano v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 177</p> <p>Delivered 29/09/2017</p> <p>Co-offender of: <i>Mansfield v The</i></p>	<p>18 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Illicit drug user.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant and the co-offender Mansfield agreed to kill the deceased.</p> <p>The appellant and Mansfield took possession of a rifle. Later that day the appellant went with the deceased, in the deceased's car, to an isolated bush area under the pretext of collecting some stolen items.</p> <p>The appellant was aware Mansfield was already at the location, waiting with a loaded rifle. When they arrived Mansfield shot the deceased in the head, killing him.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period 23 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending aggravated; by its planning; it was unprovoked; the deceased was lured to a location where he was vulnerable and his body hidden and dealt with in a disrespectful manner.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appellant challenged length of sentence (non-parole period).</p> <p>At [210] ... the murder committed by the appellant was a very serious example of offending of that kind. Although he did not shoot the deceased, the appellant joined with Mr Mansfield in a plan to kill him. The killing was unprovoked.</p>

	<p><i>State of Western Australia</i> [2017] WASCA 178</p>		<p>The appellant and Mansfield dumped the deceased's body in bushland several km from the site where the killing occurred. They then burnt their clothes and the wooden portions of the rifle, disposed of the remaining firearm parts and cleaned the deceased's car.</p> <p>About a week later the two, together with a third person, moved the deceased's body to another location, where it was burnt and buried in a clandestine bush grave. They also set fire to the deceased's car.</p> <p>The appellant initially denied any involvement in the killing. However, later admitted his role in the offending, but the only reason he had done so was because Mansfield had threatened him and his family; he was a very reluctant and very frightened participant in the plans to kill the deceased.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found the appellant agreed to participate in the killing; this agreement was not made as a result of any threats made by Mansfield.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant's offending no less serious than Mansfield's.</p> <p>Taken steps towards rehabilitation while in custody; well behaved in prison on remand.</p>	<p>The appellant played a crucial role in the events which culminated in the murder. Later, the appellant participated in destroying evidence and disposing of the deceased's body. The appellant facilitated the murder by inviting the deceased to attend the appellant's house. The appellant then induced the deceased, by a false pretence, to accompany him to an isolated location in the knowledge that Mr Mansfield was waiting with a loaded rifle, the deceased was highly vulnerable and Mr Mansfield intended to shoot and kill the deceased.</p> <p>At [214] In the present case, the objective seriousness of the appellant's offending, including the circumstances in which the deceased was murdered, combined with the importance of personal and general deterrence, reduced to a very substantial extent the mitigating effect of the</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--

					appellant's youth. At [215] ... The length of the min non-parole period was not unreasonable or plainly unjust.
17.	<i>Gore v The State of Western Australia</i> [2017] WASCA 163 Delivered 01/09/2017	44 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after trial. No relevant prior criminal history. Single indigenous woman; lived and raised in the Kimberley by her parents; good upbringing; close to her mother; father deceased. Left school yr 10; completed number of courses. Maintained employment; various roles. Primary caregiver to her three nieces. Long history of alcohol abuse; commenced drinking aged 17 yrs. Poor health; reduced life expectancy; progressive kidney	1 x Murder. The deceased was Gore's former partner. During their relationship Gore had been the victim of domestic violence over a number of years. They remained friends after the separation, but there had been incidents when the deceased had threatened her. Gore and others were playing cards for money. She had been drinking and was heavily intoxicated. The deceased arrived. He was also very drunk. Gore lent the deceased money so he could join in on the card game. When the deceased lost the money and Gore refused him more, he stole some from her. Gore became angry so the deceased punched her. Gore responded by punching the deceased. Someone intervened and pulled the two apart. After this altercation Gore obtained a knife and demanded her money back. The deceased refused so Gore lashed out at him several times with the knife. The first two times it inflicted score marks underneath his armpit and on his	Life imp. Min non-parole period 12 yrs imp. The trial judge found the appellant used a dangerous weapon with the intend to hurt the deceased, when he was not at the time assaulting her or posing any immediate threat to her. The trial judge found the offending aggravated in that the deceased was unarmed and the appellant had deliberately armed herself with a very dangerous weapon. In sentencing the trial judge found the offence, as a whole, at the lower end of the scale of seriousness of murders	Dismissed. Appellant challenged length of sentence; appeal concerned error in life term and non-parole period. At [43] ... the primary motivation for the offending was anger at the deceased for stealing money, rather than a belief ... that stabbing the deceased in the chest was necessary for self-defence. ... While not premeditated, and not done with any intention to kill, the appellant's act of stabbing the deceased in the chest with a kitchen knife was objectively highly likely to result in his death. At [45] The seriousness of the appellant's offending conduct was such as to be capable of supporting a

		failure requiring dialysis; rheumatic heart disease; high blood pressure.	upper forearm. The third time the knife struck him in the chest. The deceased died a short time later from a penetrating wound through the heart.	and unusual and exceptional circumstances reflected the lower min term than would usually be imposed for murder. Appellant cooperative; some formal admissions made; little risk of reoffending in similar manner when released.	conclusion that a sentence of life imp was not clearly unjust, even taking into account the significant mitigating circumstances. At [51] The offence in the present case was not in the most serious category of murder, there being no premeditation and no intent to kill the deceased. However, the appellant stabbed the deceased in the chest ... principally out of anger at her money being stolen, at a time when she had no reasonable grounds for believing there to be any necessity to act in self-defence. While the appellant's personal circumstances demanded a reduction in the non-parole which might otherwise have been fixed, they did not necessarily demand the fixing of the lowest available non-parole period of 10 yrs.
16.	<i>McIntosh v The State of Western Australia</i>	34 yrs at time offending. 38 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after re-trial.	1 x Murder. The deceased, Ms M, was a drug dealer and well known to the appellant and co-offender Hall.	Life imp. Min non-parole period 20 yrs imp.	Dismissed. Appellant challenged length of sentence and

	<p>[2017] WASCA 45</p> <p>Delivered 13/03/2017</p>	<p>Prior criminal history; convictions of sex pen child under 16 yrs and breach of VRO.</p> <p>Raised by his mother; never known his father.</p> <p>Learning difficulties; disruptive at school; left in yr 9.</p> <p>Completed trade certificate and three years of a four year apprenticeship.</p> <p>Consistent work history; frequent employment changes.</p> <p>Father to five children; living with him at time of arrest.</p> <p>Long history of substance abuse; heavy alcohol and cannabis use from 16 yrs; recreational user of methyl.</p>	<p>She supplied them both with drugs.</p> <p>The appellant and Hall met Ms M at a park and obtained methyl from her. During the transaction they became aware she had a large quantity of drugs and money.</p> <p>Shortly after returning to the appellant's home, both the appellant and Hall decided to meet Ms M again. They drove back to the park, where Ms M got into the front passenger seat of the appellant's van.</p> <p>At some point the appellant reached forward from his position in the back seat, placed a piece of wire around Ms M's neck and strangled her. After a struggle she lost consciousness.</p> <p>Believing Ms M was dead the appellant and Hall drove to a reservoir and dumped her close to the water's edge.</p> <p>They drove home and shared the drugs and money. The appellant burned some of Ms M's property and instructed Hall to dispose of it, which she did so.</p> <p>Several hours later Ms M's body was found in the water. She had either died of her injuries or drowned.</p>	<p>Sentenced on the basis the appellant intended to inflict bodily harm and it was reasonably foreseeable this would cause death.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant's offending aggravated by the fact that after he attacked Ms M he 'so readily concluded that she was dead'; he did not seek medical assistance and took actions to cover up the offence.</p> <p>The appellant showed no remorse; continued to deny the offending.</p>	<p>parity.</p> <p>At [115] ... the murder committed by the appellant was ... a serious example of offending of that kind. The appellant attacked [Ms M] suddenly and unexpectedly. The attack was unprovoked. It was persistent and relentless. He dumped her body (at a time when she was, in fact, still alive) in the reservoir... The destruction of the items was part of an attempt to conceal his involvement in the murder.</p> <p>At [117] ... the objective seriousness of the appellant's offending, and the significant sentencing factors of appropriate punishment and general deterrence, precluded the imposition of a lesser min non-parole period.</p> <p>At [123] The objective facts and circumstances of the appellant's involvement in the murder were significantly more serious</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--

					<p>than the facts and circumstances of Ms Hall's involvement. The appellant instigated the offending and strangled [Ms M]. ...</p> <p>At [124] Ms Hall confessed to the murder, assisted ... authorities and pleaded guilty.</p> <p>At [125] In addition to her lesser role in the offending, Ms Hall was remorseful.... If Ms Hall had not confessed and cooperated with the law enforcement authorities, the appellant and Ms Hall may not have been charged with the offence.</p>
15.	<p><i>Taylor v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 210</p> <p>Delivered 30/11/2016</p>	<p><u>Jones</u> 37 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Extensive prior criminal history.</p> <p>Partner and father of two children.</p> <p>Deprived childhood, marked by violence.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>Jones and Taylor were camping in a recreational reserve. The toilet block at the site was known to be frequented by homosexual men for consensual casual sex.</p> <p>Jones armed with a metal pole and Taylor with a knife, forced their way into a cubicle as the deceased was performing oral sex on Mr Y. Taylor assaulted the deceased, punching and kicking him until he was unconscious. Jones stood guard by the door.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period 21 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending was at 'the high end of the range of seriousness of murders involving an intention to cause a life endangering injury' and that neither the deceased nor Mr Y had done</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Jones challenged min non-parole period.</p> <p>At [303] I am satisfied that the objective seriousness of Mr Jones' offending, and the important sentencing considerations of appropriate punishment and personal and general deterrence, precluded the</p>

		<p>Left home at an early age and for a time lived on the streets.</p> <p>Completed yr 10 in juvenile detention.</p> <p>Long term drug and alcohol addiction.</p> <p><u>Taylor</u> (conviction appeal only) Taylor convicted of murder and sentenced to life imp. Min non-parole period 21 yrs imp.</p>	<p>Jones struck the deceased several times in the head with the pole with great force.</p> <p>Mr Y was threatened with the knife and assaulted by both Jones and Taylor before running from the toilet block.</p> <p>The deceased regained consciousness walked from the toilet block and collapsed. He died from head injuries sustained during the attack.</p>	<p>anything to provoke the assaults.</p> <p>Jones had a lack of remorse and victim empathy and continued to deny his involvement in the offence.</p>	<p>imposition of a lesser min non-parole period.</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p><i>Broadbent v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 148</p> <p>Delivered 19/08/2016</p>	<p><u>Broadbent</u> 44 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>No relevant prior criminal history.</p> <p>Supportive family; 22 yr old daughter.</p> <p>Employed at time offending.</p> <p>Regular user of methyl and alcohol.</p> <p>No mental health issues.</p> <p><u>Kosick</u> 40 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Prior criminal history, including assault and making threats.</p>	<p><u>Broadbent, Kosick and Young</u> 1 x Murder each.</p> <p>Broadbent had been in a violent and erratic relationship with the deceased.</p> <p>Broadbent and Kosick had been drinking alcohol and had consumed methylamphetamine and cannabis. Young was heavily drunk.</p> <p>Broadbent and Kosick planned to kill the deceased as a result of the deceased's abuse of Broadbent. Young did not know the deceased, Broadbent or Foster, but was a 'hit man wannabe'. He inflamed the group's unhappiness about the deceased. Kosick's former wife attempted to call the deceased, but Kosick stopped her.</p> <p>Kosick drove Young and collected Young's rifle, ammunition, gloves and balaclava. He then</p>	<p><u>Broadbent and Young</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 24 yrs imp.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found Broadbent without remorse.</p> <p><u>Kosick</u> Life imp. Min non-parole period 22 yrs imp.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found Kosick's crime rooted in methylamphetamine, not mental health.</p> <p>Sentencing judge reduced min non-parole</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeals concerned parity and length of sentences.</p> <p>At [279] The critical point as regards culpability is that Ms Broadbent, Mr Kosick and Mr Young were parties to a plan to kill Mr Blenkinsopp. Each of them had an important role to play.</p> <p>At [280] ... after she was arrested Ms Broadbent became aware that Mr Bradley had made a comprehensive statement to the police. Ms Broadbent said to Kay Kosick, while</p>

		<p>Difficult childhood; parents separated when aged 6; grew up in a family where drug use the norm.</p> <p>Left school at yr 9; worked throughout life; receiving Centrelink pension at time offending.</p> <p>Previously married; two children.</p> <p>Suffers from PTSD.</p> <p>Heavy methyl user.</p> <p><u>Young</u> 53 yrs at time offending; 55 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Serious criminal history, but no lengthy history of violence.</p> <p>Significantly disadvantaged as a child; no role model; limited family; raised in foster homes.</p> <p>Educated to yr 11; completed an apprenticeship; gainfully employed all his adult life.</p> <p>Unstable mental state.</p>	<p>drove them all in search of the deceased. Broadbent lured the deceased from the house he was at and to his death.</p> <p>Young shot the deceased three times. The deceased staggered onto the road where Kosick ran over him with such force that his head struck the windscreen, cracking the glass.</p> <p>The deceased was then taken to another location, shot in the head at close range by Young, and buried. Broadbent fired two shots into the grave.</p> <p>Young threatened to kill Kosick's former wife and her children if she did not help conceal the evidence. He stored his gun at her garage.</p> <p>The appellants' cleaned the car and replaced the cracked windscreen. They disposed of the seat covers and clothing. Kosick's former wife lent clothing to Broadbent.</p> <p>Broadbent lied twice to police before telling at least a version of the truth. Young denied the offence and became aggressive. Kosick initially deceived police, but later gave a version of events, minimising his involvement. Kosick also showed police the gravesite.</p> <p>Ryan Bradley, who was present earlier in the night, gave a statement to police. While in custody, Broadbent threatened to kill Bradley.</p>	<p>period by 2 yrs to reflect Kosick's cooperation with the police.</p>	<p>they were in custody, that Mr Bradley 'is dead', and then repeated that threat in 'more graphic language' ... Both Mr Young and Ms Broadbent made threats in order to conceal what had occurred. There is no material point of distinction between them.</p> <p>At [290] A difference in gender is not, of itself, a factor that requires or justifies disparity.</p> <p>At [306] Mr Kosick was an enthusiastic participant in the plan.</p> <p>At [327] There were no material differences between Mr Kosick, on the one hand, and Ms Broadbent and Mr Young, on the other, either in relation to their role in the offending or in relation to matters of agg or mitigation, that required or justified greater disparity beyond the 2-yr reduction that Mr Kosick received because he led the police to</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Not a user of illicit drugs; binge drinker most of his life.</p> <p><u>Foster</u> Co-offender Foster was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to 8 yrs imp. EFP.</p>			the gravesite.
13.	<p><i>Corbett v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 97</p> <p>Delivered 15/06/2016</p>	<p>28 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Significant criminal history, including offences of violence.</p> <p>Dysfunctional up-bringing; exposed to violence and substance abuse.</p> <p>Learning difficulties; bullied at school; educated to yr 10.</p> <p>Brief periods of employment; unemployed at time offending.</p> <p>History of violent relationships.</p> <p>Entrenched history of drug and alcohol abuse.</p> <p>Physical health issues relating to his substance use; treated for depression.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant and the deceased had been in a troubled and violent relationship for some time.</p> <p>The deceased was an 18-year-old female. The appellant was significantly taller and heavier than the deceased.</p> <p>The deceased was at the appellant's home where they both consumed methamphetamine. The appellant also consumed cannabis.</p> <p>At some point the appellant became enraged and hit the deceased repeatedly, over a prolonged period of time. The blows were not inflicted with a weapon.</p> <p>The deceased suffered multiple injuries to her head and neck, arms and trunk, including fractured ribs.</p> <p>The appellant cleaned the deceased. On becoming concerned with her unresponsive condition he called an ambulance.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period of 18 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant intended to cause serious injury.</p> <p>The sentencing judge did not consider there to be a large difference between the intention he found and an intention to cause death.</p> <p>Remorseful; high risk of violent re-offending.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [105]-[109] Discussion of comparative cases.</p> <p>At [110] Although not in the most serious category, the current offence was not at the lower end of the scale of seriousness of offences of its type. Aggravating features of the offence included the sustained nature of the attack on the deceased, when the deceased was in a vulnerable position, in a manifestation of domestic violence which characterised the relationship.</p> <p>At [111] Considerations of general deterrence are significant in cases of this kind.</p>

			The deceased died the following day from head injuries.		At [114] The mitigating circumstances arising from the appellant's personal circumstances were limited to his belated expressions of remorse, victim empathy and acceptance of responsibility, and his dysfunctional background ... He was assessed as presenting a high risk of future violent offending, including in intimate relationships.
12.	<p><i>Crossland v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 93</p> <p>Delivered 09/06/2016</p>	<p>24 yrs at time offending. 27 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Lengthy criminal history, including offences involving drugs, dishonesty and weapons and a prior conviction for armed robbery.</p> <p>Difficult and disadvantaged childhood; abandoned by his mother and cared for by family members; supportive grandparents; alleged physical abuse by an uncle.</p> <p>Homeless and lived on the</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant was staying with the deceased and on the evening of the offence there was hostility between the two of them.</p> <p>The deceased was unarmed and sitting on a couch when the appellant stabbed the deceased in the right thigh with a knife. The deceased suffered a 13cm deep wound, cutting the femoral vein and artery in his leg.</p> <p>The appellant then hit the deceased with a cricket bat twice across the head, causing multiple fractures to his skull and jaw.</p> <p>The appellant left the flat, stealing a phone, money and a camera.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period of 20 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>Sentenced on basis the murder was not premediated.</p> <p>The sentencing judge was not prepared to find that the appellant subjectively believed that his actions were necessary to defend himself from the deceased.</p> <p>Remorseful; high risk of violent reoffending,</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [54] Notwithstanding that an intention to kill was not established, this was a comparatively serious case of murder. The deceased was attacked in his own home by a person to whom the deceased had extended hospitality. The appellant employed a very high level of violence using two weapons to inflict serious injuries that were objectively highly likely to cause death, particularly when they were not treated. Having inflicted those</p>

		<p>streets from age 12.</p> <p>Limited employment history; unemployed at time offending.</p> <p>Diagnosed with PTSD.</p> <p>Long history of drug abuse and under the influence of illicit drugs at time offending.</p> <p>Father of four children, to two relationships.</p> <p>Poor health; multiple admissions to hospital as a result of assaults, fights or self-harm.</p>	<p>The appellant disposed of the knife and bat.</p> <p>The deceased died from a combination of his injuries.</p> <p>Some days later the appellant handed himself into police. He stated that he stabbed and hit the deceased in self-defence.</p>	<p>without significant drug rehabilitation and psychiatric and psychological assistance.</p>	<p>injuries on the deceased, the appellant left him alone in his home without any assistance or ... any ability to obtain assistance. While he was dead or dying, the appellant stole some of his property. The appellant took active steps to conceal his crime by taking and disposing of the murder weapons.</p>
11.	<p><i>Cameron v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 92</p> <p>Delivered 08/06/2016</p>	<p>19 yrs at time offending. 20 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (25% discount for agg burg and steal motor vehicle offences).</p> <p>Prior criminal history, including multiple offences of stealing; agg common assault; agg burg and breach of bail.</p> <p>Very turbulent, disturbed and difficult childhood. Discipline issues and violent from age 11. History of fire setting and cruelty to animals.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg (dwelling). Ct 2: Murder (victim 1). Ct 3: Murder (victim 2). Ct 4: Steal motor vehicle.</p> <p>Victim 1 is a female aged 26 yrs; victim 2 is victim 1's mother aged 68 yrs.</p> <p>After seeing victim 2 enter her home the appellant armed himself with a hammer and walked into the house through an open rear door.</p> <p>The appellant went to the bedroom of victim 1, who was naked having just showered. The appellant struck her on the head twice with the hammer.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 15 yrs imp (conc). Cts 2 and 3: Life imp on each ct (conc). Min non-parole period of 32 yrs on each ct. Ct 4: 5 yrs 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offences were "of the most serious nature and of the worst kind in their categories" and there did not appear to be any clear motive.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appellant challenged offence characterization (worst category) and length of min non-parole period.</p> <p>At [79] ... the murders were within the range of the 'worst category' of cases of murder.</p> <p>At [80] ... the offence of stealing a motor vehicle was especially egregious in that ... it involved 'stealing from a house where two</p>

		<p>Diagnosed with ADHD as a child.</p> <p>Long standing drug abuse habit, resulting in mental health issues.</p> <p>Never worked.</p> <p>Three children from three relationships.</p> <p>History of domestic violence and assault.</p>	<p>Knowing another person was also in the house the appellant then went to the main bedroom. He struck victim 2 on the head with the hammer, covered her head with a pair of shorts and pulled her T-shirt over her shoulders to expose her bare chest. She was otherwise naked.</p> <p>The appellant returned to victim 1, put on a condom and had sexual intercourse with her until he ejaculated. It is unknown whether the victim was alive or dead, but she was unconscious.</p> <p>At some point he stabbed victim 2 in the chest with a pair of scissors. He also stabbed victim 1 six times in the chest and inflicted penetrating wounds to her throat.</p> <p>The appellant stole victim 1's car and drove it to a number of places around the metropolitan area, eventually parking it in a street, where it was located by police the next day.</p>	<p>occupants [had] been killed without any attempt to see to their welfare' ... and, further, the appellant stole the motor vehicle for the purpose of making good his escape and having committed murders within the 'worst category' of cases of that kind.</p> <p>At [123]–[177] Discussion of comparative cases.</p> <p>At [183] ... the extraordinary degree of objective seriousness of the appellant's offending, and the need to protect public safety as a consequence of his significant risk of violent reoffending, required that the mitigating effect of his youth and traumatic childhood be reduced substantially in determining the sentencing outcome.</p> <p>At [187] The objective seriousness of the appellant's offending, and the important sentencing considerations of condign</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					punishment [for the random, intentional and unprovoked killing of two vulnerable people, during an agg home burglary, by brutal and sustained violence], the protection of the public and personal and general deterrence, precluded the imposition of a lesser min non-parole period ... despite the appellant's youth, early PG and traumatic childhood.
10.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Stoeski</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 16</p> <p>Delivered 19/01/2016</p>	<p>36 yrs at time offending; 38 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG.</p> <p>No prior criminal history.</p> <p>Good employment history.</p> <p>Multiple mental illnesses.</p> <p>Entrenched drug abuse; erratic behaviour when under influence of drugs.</p>	<p>2 x Murder.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u> The deceased was the respondent's long-term partner and the mother of his two young children. The respondent killed the deceased by asphyxiation. After killing her, the respondent bound her head and neck with duct tape and wrote '666 SLUT' across her forehead. The murder was motivated by the respondent's unfounded and delusional belief in the deceased's infidelity.</p> <p><u>Ct 2</u> The respondent left their home and drove to the second deceased's house. The second deceased was the respondent's long-term friend and associate.</p> <p>The respondent and deceased argued about the</p>	<p>Life imp on each ct (conc). Min non-parole period of 21 yrs on each ct.</p> <p>Remorse; good prospects of rehabilitation.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found that the respondent's decision to kill each of the victims was "spontaneous" and "did not involve anything in the nature of planning or premeditation of anything resembling a rational kind".</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Re-sentenced to a non-parole period of 27 yrs on each ct.</p> <p>[51]-[141] Discussion of comparable cases.</p> <p>At [153] ...there were numerous features of the respondent's offending, and its consequences, that placed the murders, individually and collectively, at or towards the high end of the scale of seriousness... the respondent's murder of the first victim has in effect</p>

			<p>respondent's unfounded and delusional belief that he was spreading rumours about him. The respondent stabbed the deceased with a fishing knife three times at the base to the side of his neck and once in the upper arm. The respondent struck the deceased repeatedly to the head with a wishbone-type vehicle component, causing significant head trauma.</p>	<p>deprived their young children... of their parents, with obvious long-term traumatic consequences... the murders have had a significant and ongoing negative impact on the families of the victims.</p> <p>At [158] The respondent was intoxicated with methylamphetamine at the time of the offending. His psychotic disorder was, most likely, induced by his ingestion of drugs. No other mental illness, unrelated to drug abuse, was involved in the offending... The offender is morally responsible for his ...condition.</p> <p>At [159] ...the primary sentencing considerations were condign punishment (for the intentional and unprovoked killing of two vulnerable people by the application of brutal, sustained and unprovoked violence) and personal and general deterrence. Personal deterrence was</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>less important in view of the sentencing judge's unchallenged finding as to the respondent's 'good prospects of rehabilitation', but it remained a relevant consideration.</p> <p>At [160] ...the terms of 21 yrs did not adequately reflect the fact that the respondent committed two discrete murders, each of which had the serious features that I have described, in different locations, by different means and with an interval of time between the murders, and the value which Parliament...has placed on human life... The min non-parole periods fixed by his Honour ...were substantially outside the sentencing range open on a proper exercise of his Honour's discretion.</p>
9.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Churchill</i></p> <p>[2015] WASCA</p>	<p>41 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Extensive prior criminal history, including convictions of</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The deceased was 28 yrs old and was in a domestic relationship with the respondent. He was weak and vulnerable compared to the respondent.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period of 17 yrs.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Re-sentenced to a non-parole period of 21 yrs.</p> <p>At [37] The circumstances</p>

<p>257</p> <p>Delivered 23/12/2015</p>	<p>manslaughter, poss weapon, GBH, 3 x wounding and 2 x threats.</p> <p>Parents separated at age 10; father died at age 12 and mother died at age 15.</p> <p>Gave birth to first child at age 16.</p> <p>Subject to physical and sexual abuse during her life.</p> <p>Long history of alcoholism.</p>	<p>The respondent and the deceased were intoxicated. The respondent argued with the deceased and made three threats to kill him. She threw bottles at him and chased him wielding a bottle. She attempted to hit him over the head with a bottle. She swung a wheel brace at him. She hit him in the face with a beer can.</p> <p>The following day, the appellant inflicted a sustained, prolonged and severe assault on the deceased with two knives and an electric frypan. He suffered 14 stab injuries and 26 incised injuries to multiple parts of his body. The injury to the deceased's chest penetrated the chest cavity and extended into the front aspect of the left lung, which was partially collapsed. Injuries to the deceased's hands were consistent with him attempting to defend himself from the respondent's repeated attacks.</p> <p>The cause of death was multiple penetrating stab and incised cut injuries, including a stab wound to the chest.</p> <p>After the attack, the respondent mopped up the blood from the house and washed the blood from the deceased's body. The respondent lied about what had happened to the deceased.</p>		<p>of the respondent's offence place it at the high end of the scale of seriousness of the offence of murder. She engaged in a sustained, prolonged, frenzied attack on Mr Dunn, whom she intended to kill. She used multiple weapons and went to considerable lengths to attempt to cover up the murder. His death was the culmination of a broader course of violence inflicted on him by the respondent. No doubt her long standing alcoholism contributed to the commission of this crime, as it has done throughout her long history of violent offending. Of greater significance is her inability to control her volcanic eruptions of anger, and the regularity and normalisation of her use of violence. Her record and her lack of remorse, insight and acceptance of responsibility for the death of Mr Dunn are manifestations of that normalisation.</p>
---	---	--	--	---

					At [38] The only mitigating factor of any significance is the respondent's disadvantaged and dysfunctional upbringing.
8.	<p><i>Zwerus v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2015] WASCA 174</p> <p>Delivered 02/09/2015</p>	<p>33 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG.</p> <p>Short criminal history, including convictions of common assault, AOBH, unlawful wounding, poss a controlled weapon and breaches of bail and restraining orders.</p> <p>Close relationship with his mother; father deceased.</p> <p>Completed apprenticeship; worked as a roof tiler; worked as a process technician in the mines; excelled in sports.</p> <p>Two children from former relationship; appellant gave up work to care for children after former partner died.</p> <p>Entrenched history of illicit drug abuse.</p> <p>Suffers from drug-induced psychosis; undertook treatment</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant had been on a methyl and cannabis binge for at least two weeks leading up to offence. He was observed as delusional, paranoid and behaving in an increasingly bizarre manner. On the day before the offence, he appeared to be hallucinating.</p> <p>The appellant was in a state of drug-induced psychosis and formed the belief that he had to kill a man at the beach. The appellant went to the beach, armed with a knife, with the intention to carry out that belief.</p> <p>The appellant came across the deceased and, because of the behaviour of the appellant's dog, believed that the deceased was the man he had to kill. The two men were strangers. The appellant attacked him with a knife using considerable force. He inflicted multiple stab wounds to the deceased's head, neck, back and left shoulder, and fractured his jaw. Wounds on the deceased's hands suggested that he attempted to defend himself. The deceased died soon afterwards.</p> <p>The appellant dragged the deceased's body into the sea and attempted to conceal evidence of what he had done.</p>	<p>Life imp. Min non-parole period of 18 yrs.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found appellant suffered from drug-induced psychosis at time offending; appellant's decision to kill was a product of the psychosis; appellant had some appreciation of what he was doing and the seriousness and wrongfulness of his actions.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found the psychosis was a product of voluntary and prolonged use of methyl and cannabis; psychosis affected appellant's judgment and caused him to be more aggressive; appellant had some awareness of the effect the drugs had upon him.</p>	<p>Dismissed – on papers.</p> <p>At [25] The deceased was entirely innocent, unsuspecting and without the means to defend himself. The attack was, as his Honour said, savage and brutal. It was randomly committed against a person who was enjoying an early morning walk along his local beach. It is a truly shocking offence... There were periods in the time leading up to the commission of the offence where the appellant realised he was behaving in a bizarre and psychotic fashion due to his ingestion of illicit drugs. Nevertheless, he continued to use them. The appellant's psychosis was self-induced. It is well-established in this State that, in these circumstances, psychosis had no mitigatory</p>

		while in custody.		Sentencing judge found the appellant was genuinely remorseful; good prospects of rehabilitation; low risk of re-offending if able to successfully deal with substance abuse issues.	effect...
7.	<i>Attwell v The State of Western Australia</i> [2015] WASCA 84 Delivered 30/04/2015	72 yrs at time offending. 74 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after trial. Minor irrelevant criminal history. Successful businessman; highly regarded by local community. Suffers from type 2 diabetes and vascular disease. No serious mental illness.	1 x Attempt to Procure Another to Murder. Ms Attwell is the estranged wife of one of the appellant's sons. Property settlement proceedings had commenced in the Family Court. The appellant had a conversation with Mr R who had come to the appellant to explore the possibility of employment. Without any prompting, the appellant offered Mr R \$30,000 to get rid of Ms Attwell. Mr R said that he knew someone who would be willing to do the job and said he would telephone him to find out. Mr R reported the conversation to police. Mr R telephoned the appellant and told him that he had a mate named 'Josh' (UCO) who would be pretty keen. The appellant indicated that 'Josh' should telephone him. The appellant agreed to pay Mr R a spotter's fee. 'Josh' telephoned the appellant and they arranged to meet. At the meeting, the appellant provided the address, vehicle details and a physical description of Ms Attwell. The	8 yrs 6 mths imp. EFP. Did not accept any responsibility for offending; no remorse; no victim empathy. Premeditated, planned and persistent. Imprisonment would be more difficult for the appellant due to the appellant's health. Offending caused adverse psychological and other consequences for Ms Attwell.	Dismissed. At [45] a person who attempts to procure the murder of another is liable to... life imp. At [54] Although the offence was inchoate and Ms Attwell was never at risk of being harmed, the appellant wanted her killed and did all he could to achieve this end. At [56] The present case does not fall within the worst category of offences of this type... At [58] Discussion of comparative cases. At [66] It is significant that, at the time the appellant committed the offence, he

			<p>appellant spoke to 'Josh' about how he wanted Ms Attwell killed and how he wanted her body disposed of. He offered one of his excavators to dig a hole and put her down 30 feet. The appellant paid 'Josh' a deposit of \$7,000.</p> <p>They met again the following day where the appellant paid a further deposit of \$3,000. The appellant also provided details of a second address for Ms Attwell. He confirmed that the remaining \$20,000 would be paid when Ms Attwell was killed. The meeting concluded on the basis that 'Josh' would call the appellant prior to the killing so that the appellant would go somewhere to be seen so as to provide him with an alibi.</p> <p>The appellant denied that he had asked 'Josh' to kill Ms Attwell.</p>		<p>was still very much involved with the day-to-day running of his business and making complex and important decisions. His age was not a barrier in these respects...I do not regard this case as being one where advanced age reduced the weight to be given to considerations of personal and general deterrence, particularly as the appellant refused to accept responsibility for his offending and showed no remorse.</p> <p>At [67] ... I regard the sentence that was imposed upon the appellant as being within the upper levels of the range of sentences available to the sentencing judge in the proper exercise of the discretion conferred upon him.</p>
6.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Smith</i></p> <p>[2015] WASCA 87</p>	<p>28 yrs at time offending; 30 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted of ct 1 after trial; convicted of ct 2 after PG.</p> <p>Prior criminal history, including</p>	<p>Ct 1: Murder. Ct 2: Arson.</p> <p>The respondent was homeless. The victim invited the respondent to stay with him. The second night, the respondent and victim drank alcohol at the victim's unit and had an argument.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Life imp. Min non parole period of 17 yrs.</p> <p>Ct 2: Arson: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>Depression; antisocial</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [49]-[122] and [178]-[180] Discussion of comparative cases.</p> <p>At [184] In our opinion, the</p>

	Delivered 04/05/2015	<p>AOBH and dishonesty offences.</p> <p>Dysfunctional childhood; witnessed domestic violence; parents separated when he was five; left home by age 14.</p> <p>Single; father of 7 yr old daughter; no contact with daughter.</p> <p>Supportive mother.</p> <p>History of substance abuse.</p>	<p>The respondent launched an unprovoked, extremely violent and sustained attack on the victim. Using a coffee table leg, the respondent repeatedly hit the victim on the head, face and arms, causing lacerations and haemorrhages to the head and a fractured nose and lower jaw. The respondent used a knife to repeatedly stab the victim. He stabbed him in the back, which pierced his lung and caused internal bleeding. He cut the Achilles tendon on his left leg. Intending to kill the victim, the respondent inflicted nine wounds to the victim's neck. Several of these wounds severed his jugular vein, which was the likely cause of death.</p> <p>The respondent had no memory of killing the victim. His next memory after the argument is standing over the victim, who was covered in blood and not breathing. The respondent covered the body with a blanket, showered and went to bed. The following morning, the respondent set fire to the unit, to conceal what he had done, and left. The unit was a ground floor unit in a double storey apartment building. The fire gutted the unit.</p> <p>The respondent initially denied the offence. He later made partial admissions but maintained he had no memory of inflicting violence upon the victim.</p>	<p>personality; poor coping and problem-solving skills; anger management problems associated with episodes of rage in the context of alcohol abuse.</p> <p>Significant remorse; low risk of reoffending.</p>	<p>minimum term of 17 yrs was lenient. If we had been sentencing the respondent at first instance we would have imposed a higher non-parole period. However... we are not persuaded that the minimum term of 17 yrs was below the range open to his Honour on a proper exercise of the sentencing discretion.</p>
5.	<i>Angliss v The State of Western</i>	18 yrs at time offending. 20 yrs at time sentencing.	1 x Murder. The appellant and victim were living on the	Life imp. Min non parole period	Dismissed. At [25] Suffice to say that it

	<p>Australia</p> <p>[2015] WASCA 8</p> <p>Delivered 16/01/2015</p>	<p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Homeless; volatile and violent relationship with heavily pregnant older girlfriend at time offending.</p> <p>Middle of 7 children; parents separated; mother left at age 10 or 11; transient living arrangements during teenage years; expelled from high school after yr 9; history of aggressive behaviour.</p> <p>History of depression.</p> <p>Drug and alcohol problem.</p>	<p>streets of Fremantle. The victim suffered from a disease that resulted in him walking with a limp.</p> <p>The appellant believed the victim had a sexual relationship with the appellant's girlfriend. The appellant started a physical altercation with the victim two days before the offence.</p> <p>In the late afternoon of 4 September 2012, the appellant, his friend and the victim were drinking alcohol together for some time. The murder appears to have occurred in a laneway. Exactly what happened is unknown. Victim had been severely beaten and the appellant repeatedly stabbed him with a pair of scissors. The appellant's friend may have played a part in causing some of the victim's injuries, but the appellant initiated the assault and inflicted the fatal injuries. The number, nature and location of the stab wounds were consistent only with an intention to kill. The appellant fled the scene and disposed of the scissors down a drain.</p> <p>The appellant made certain admissions and showed police where the scissors had been disposed. He subsequently retracted the admissions and blamed his friend entirely for the killing.</p>	<p>of 18 yrs.</p> <p>Not premeditated; unprovoked, frenzied and sustained attack on a vulnerable victim.</p> <p>High risk of violent reoffending.</p> <p>Limited weight given to initial cooperation with police.</p> <p>Dysfunctional childhood and youth heavily outweighed by seriousness of offending. Youth indicated prospect of rehabilitation; non parole period reduced.</p>	<p>is clear that the minimum term in this case is broadly consistent with other sentences that have been imposed.</p>
4.	<p>Mack v The State of Western Australia</p> <p>[2014] WASCA</p>	<p>23 yrs at time of offending, 27 yrs at time of sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial (Judge alone).</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant is the deceased's son.</p> <p>The deceased lived a very private life and had only spasmodic contact with extended family</p>	<p>Life imp.</p> <p>Min non parole period of 20 yrs.</p> <p>No remorse; continually</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [200] It is well-established that where an offender's mental illness or psychological difficulties</p>

<p>207</p> <p>Delivered 10/11/2014</p>	<p>Criminal record including offences of giving false personal details to police, using a false number plate, fraud, stealing and breach of bail.</p> <p>Suffered from autism spectrum disorder and severe depression.</p>	<p>members and a few friends. She had two sons. The deceased inherited a substantial amount of money and assets from her husband's estate.</p> <p>In the months leading to her death the deceased was well, happy and positive in her outlook.</p> <p>No one had seen or had direct contact with the deceased for some time. The deceased was reported as a missing person by extended family and subsequently police investigated.</p> <p>It was found that the appellant killed his mother by unknown means to gain control of her money and property. The appellant disposed of her body at night in a grave he dug. He added lime to hasten decomposition. His method of disposing of his mother's body was calculated to conceal her death and the cause of death. The appellant informed police of the general location of his mother's body. Police carried out an exhaustive search and investigations however no body was recovered. Her remains have never been found.</p> <p>The appellant deliberately and persistently told lies to divert attention from his crime, including to the police, his brother and other relatives.</p> <p>Following her death the appellant stole substantial amounts of money and other property from her estate by writing cheques, transferring funds, forging leases and continuing to live at the deceased's house.</p>	<p>denied responsibility for the offending.</p> <p>Trial judge found the appellant's motive for unlawfully killing his mother was to gain control of her money and other assets.</p> <p>Trial judge described offence as 'a most serious crime'.</p> <p>Found, on the basis of expert evidence, that the appellant was significantly impaired by his autism, but there was no casual connection between the appellant's autism and his commission of the crime.</p> <p>Low risk of violent re-offending.</p>	<p>have not been self-induced, his or her condition is a relevant factor in the sentencing process.</p>
---	--	---	--	---

			Over an 18 month period more than \$225,000 in cheques were drawn on the bank accounts of the deceased and those funds were traced to bank accounts held in the name of the appellant. The money the appellant stole financed his business venture in computer repairs.		
3.	<p><i>Stinson v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2014] WASCA 72</p> <p>Delivered 10/04/2014</p>	<p>57 yrs at time of offending.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG.</p> <p>No prior convictions.</p> <p>Difficult upbringing; placed in State care at 18 mths; grew up in Children's home.</p> <p>History of misuse of alcohol.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant, a married man, had been in an extramarital relationship with the deceased for about 3 – 4 yrs.</p> <p>The deceased stayed at the appellant's house for a week while his wife and daughter were overseas. During that time the appellant and deceased argued and had physical altercations.</p> <p>At some point the appellant asked the deceased to pack her belongings, saying he would take her home. On the way to her home, the appellant drove the deceased into the Belmont Park Racecourse where he was employed as a security officer. The appellant drove to the centre of the racecourse where they both got out of the car and argued. The appellant retrieved a club hammer from his vehicle and used it to inflict multiple strikes to the deceased's head. The appellant then put the deceased into the tray of his utility and drove to a horse wash bay where he hosed blood from the deceased. With the deceased concealed in the tray of the ute, the appellant drove to a street in Maddington where he dumped her naked body on a street verge. He</p>	<p>Life imp.</p> <p>Min non parole period of 17 yrs.</p> <p>Co-operated with authorities.</p> <p>Remorseful; accepted responsibility for his conduct.</p> <p>Sentencing judge rejected appellant's claim he had killed the deceased because she had called his wife and daughter 'Asian sluts' and 'whores' and had said she would scream rape.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found the appellant intended to kill the deceased, at least after the initial blow that caused her to fall to the</p>	<p>Dismissed – on papers.</p> <p>At [18] The minimum period of 17 years' imposed in this case is broadly consistent with sentences imposed for what is the most serious offence in the Code. The circumstances of the appellant's offending are towards the upper end of the scale of seriousness.</p>

			<p>left the scene and made further efforts to clean his vehicle by hosing it down. The appellant then dove to a semi-bush area where he disposed of his soiled clothing and that of the deceased. He also disposed of the murder weapon at an unknown location.</p> <p>Medical evidence established a pattern of numerous and severe blows to the deceased's head which brought about her death, at the very latest, soon after the blows ceased.</p>	<p>ground. He also found that no significant premeditation or planning was involved.</p> <p>Sentencing judge concluded did not suffer from any major or significant psychiatric or mental illness.</p>	
2.	<p><i>Rosewood v The State of Western</i></p> <p>[2014] WASCA 21</p> <p>Delivered 29/01/2014</p>	<p>37 yrs at time offending. 38 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG.</p> <p>Criminal record including threats to injure, endanger or harm, AOBH and unlawful wounding against former partners.</p> <p>Father Caucasian; mother from Walpiri and Gridindji tribe; not a traditional Aboriginal man and has no cultural or spiritual connection to the land.</p> <p>Witnessed chronic and acute domestic violence in his childhood; siblings stayed in foster homes until school age; both parents' heavy drinkers.</p>	<p>1 x Murder.</p> <p>The appellant and deceased had been in a family and domestic relationship for about 12 months. They had a child aged 3 mths. Both had children from previous relationships.</p> <p>The offence was committed in the presence of the deceased's extended family, including young children.</p> <p>The deceased and appellant had been staying with relatives. On the day of the offence the appellant and deceased had been drinking all day. They argued in the evening which later escalated. The appellant reached into the kitchen sink and grabbed a chopping knife. He stabbed the deceased in the chest. The deceased turned away and the appellant stabbed twice to the shoulder before she fell to the ground.</p> <p>The appellant walked out of the house to the front yard where he dropped the knife. Other</p>	<p>Life imprisonment.</p> <p>Min non-parole period of 18 yrs.</p> <p>Made admissions including stabbing the deceased at least once; denied intending to kill the deceased.</p> <p>High risk of violent re-offending in respect of intimate partners; moderate risk in respect of others.</p> <p>State relied on an intention to cause bodily injury of such a nature as to endanger or be likely to endanger the life of the deceased.</p>	Dismissed.

		Alcohol problem. Heavily intoxicated at time of offending.	occupants of the house called emergency services. The deceased was pronounced dead on her arrival at hospital. The cause of death was penetrating wound to the chest which penetrated the heart and the pulmonary trunk. The appellant remained at the scene where he was arrested.		
1.	<i>Prestidge v The State of Western Australia</i> [2014] WASCA 16 Delivered 24/01/2014	41 yrs at time offending. 51 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after trial (acquitted of wilful murder; convicted of murder). Significant criminal record including assault police, threatening behaviour and attempted robbery. Born in England; positive upbringing. Attended schooling until 15 yrs; employed in a number of unskilled occupations. Two children from different relationships. Mother, stepfather and sister remain supportive of him.	1 x Murder. The deceased was married to the appellant's sister. In 2002 the appellant arrived in Perth from the UK on a holiday. Soon after arriving the appellant became aware of the deceased's domestic violence against his sister and became distressed. On the day of the incident the deceased and appellant spent some time together at a pub and returned to the victim's house. Sometime later the deceased and appellant were in the kitchen. The appellant struck the deceased with intent to cause serious bodily injury at least twice to the head with a heavy weapon using severe and substantial force. The deceased fell to the ground, rapidly lost consciousness and died shortly after. His death was caused by a head injury. The weapon was not found. The appellant hid the deceased's body underneath some bedding, locked the house and	Life imp. Min non-parole period of 17 yrs. Circumstantial evidence against appellant was very strong. Little evidence of true remorse. Sentencing judge decided not to sentence the appellant on the basis he had earlier formed an intention to attack the deceased; she did not accept the appellant's version of events at the house. Trial judge found the appellant's post-offence conduct aggravated his offending in several	Dismissed. At [74] The appellant did not have the mitigation that a plea of guilty would have brought, but he received credit in the sentencing process for his cooperation in the course of the trial...

			<p>left. He disposed of incriminating evidence and left the country. He did not inform anyone of the victim's death. The appellant's body was found by Police two days later.</p> <p>The appellant did not return to Australia until 2011 when he was extradited from Thailand.</p> <p>Defence case was based primarily on self-defence.</p>	<p>aspects.</p> <p>Grief experienced by deceased's family was exacerbated by the appellant's flight from the jurisdiction.</p>	
2008 Homicide Amendments – effective 1 August 2008					