

Threats

ss 338A and 338B *Criminal Code*

From 1 January 2014

Transitional Sentencing Provisions: This table is divided into thirds based on the three relevant periods of Sentencing Provisions:

- Post-transitional provisions period
- Transitional provisions period
- Pre-transitional provisions period

These periods are separated by a row which shows when the transitional provisions were enacted, and another showing when they were repealed.

Glossary:

imp	imprisonment
susp	suspended
conc	concurrent
cum	cumulative
PG	plead guilty
agg	aggravated
burg	burglary
sex pen	sexual penetration without consent
AOBH	assault occasioning bodily harm
GBH	grievous bodily harm
dep lib	deprivation of liberty
att	attempted
TES	total effective sentence
SIO	suspended imprisonment order
CBO	community based order
BAC	blood alcohol content
DUI	driving under the influence
disq	disqualification

No.	Case	Antecedents	Summary/Facts	Sentence	Appeal
13.	<p><i>Garlett-Exell v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 179</p> <p>Delivered 29/10/2020</p>	<p>23 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after very late PG (6% discount ct 1; 10% discount cts 2 & 3).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; first serving period in juvenile detention at age 13 yrs; serving 19 mths term of imp at time offending.</p> <p>One of 11 children; further 7 half siblings; unstable and deprived childhood; exposed to violence and drugs; taken into care aged 4 yrs; placed with his maternal grandmother.</p> <p>Left school aged 11; illiterate.</p> <p>Two children aged 5 yrs and 6 yrs; no contact with their mother.</p> <p>Intravenous methyl use from aged 12 yrs.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Riotous assembly resulting in unlawful damage.</p> <p>Cts 2 & 3: Threat to kill.</p> <p>Garlett-Exell and his five co-offers were sentenced prisoners incarcerated in a regional prison. With family unable to visit they made requests to be returned to facilities in Perth. Unhappy with the responses given by prison authorities they decided to protest. Garlett-Exell instigated the plan.</p> <p>Garlett-Exell and some of the co-offenders prepared for the riot, breaking basins and toilets in their cells. When the security grille landing was closed they damaged the lock so that it would not open. This prevented authorities from entering the unit to stop the rioting.</p> <p>Garlett-Exell and his co-offenders then began damaging basins, toilets, pipes, light fittings and TV cameras. They used mattresses as barricades and flooded the unit with sewerage and water. Smashed pieces of porcelain were thrown towards prison officers.</p> <p>Garlett-Exell made repeated demands, telling prison officers the rioting would not stop until he and the co-offenders were all returned to Perth. He also personally smashed items and made threats to harm them.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 2 yrs 11 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>Ct 2: 4 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>Ct 3: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 3 yrs 3 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge sentenced the appellant on the basis he was the instigator of the riot; made most of the demands and was the one that negotiated with prison authorities.</p> <p>No demonstrated remorse; high risk of reoffending.</p>	<p>Dismissed – on papers.</p> <p>Appeal concerned parity principle.</p> <p>At [59] In our view, the differences in the sentences imposed on the appellant for ct 1 and the sentences imposed on his co-offenders for the same offence are explicable by the finding that the appellant was the instigator of the riot and his greater role in the riot, the different stages at which the appellant and his co-offenders PG, and the application of the totality principle having regard to the pre-existing sentences of the offenders ...</p>

			<p>Garlett-Exell negotiated with prison authorities when they sought to resolve the matter. When this failed and prison staff were forced to retreat specialised armed riot officers were dispatched. The riot officers eventually gained access to the unit.</p> <p>Prior to the end of the riot Garlett-Exell went to the cell of two inmates and told them to leave or he would kill them. The inmates, who had stayed out of the conflict by remaining in their cell, believed the threats and left their cell, very frightened and at one-point kneeling on the ground.</p>		
12.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Richards</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 129</p> <p>Delivered 19/08/2020</p>	<p>38 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p><u>Indictment 1234</u> Convicted after trial (judge alone).</p> <p><u>Indictment 986</u> Convicted after PG (5% discount).</p> <p>Substantial criminal history; no prior sentences of imp.</p> <p>Unremarkable childhood; raised by brother following parent's separation.</p> <p>Prior 18 yr relationship.</p> <p>Good employment history; employed various industries, including mining and construction.</p>	<p><u>Ind 1234</u> Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Steal MV. Ct 3: Threats with intent to gain benefit.</p> <p><u>Ind 986</u> Ct 1: Poss methyl wiss 13.06g at 78% purity.</p> <p><u>Ind 1234</u> Richards was on bail for the offence the subject of Ind 986 when he committed these offences.</p> <p>Richards believed the victim owned him \$10,000.</p> <p>In the early hrs of the morning Richards, in the company of two men, went to the home occupied by the victim, her partner and their children.</p>	<p><u>Ind 1234</u> Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>Ind 986</u> Ct 1: 16 mths (cum). TES 3 yrs 4 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p><u>Ind 1234</u> The trial judge found the respondent's offending was very serious; he was on bail at the time of committing the</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence ct 1 (Ind 1234).</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p><u>Ind 1234</u> Ct 1: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 12 mths (conc).</p> <p>Cum with 16 mths imp imposed for Ind 986.</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 10 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [29] The sentence of</p>

		<p>Likely mental health issues at time offending; attributed to substance abuse.</p> <p>History of illicit drug use.</p>	<p>The three forced entry into the house. Richards was armed with an axe, which he held to the victim's throat while one of the men took a sum of money and a car key.</p> <p>Richards then left in a car owned by the victim's partner.</p> <p>Later Richards sent the victim a message telling her to get the money or he would burn the car.</p> <p><u>Ind 986</u> Richards was found by police sitting in the driver's seat of a parked car. A search of the vehicle located the methyl in clip-seal bags, concealed beneath panels next to the gear shift.</p>	<p>offences; the offending was planned, it was premeditated and involved two other people that he took to provide him with some muscle; after stealing her car the respondent continued to threaten the victim over a number of days; the offending was not a one-off offence; it was ongoing and persistent.</p> <p><u>Ind 986</u> The trial judge found the respondent was a low-level user-dealer and 'an element of commerciality to the commission of that offence' as he admitted to selling small quantities of methyl to other people to fund his own habit.</p> <p>Co-operative; insight into his offending; steps taken towards rehabilitation; good prospects of employment upon release.</p>	<p>only 2 yrs immediate imp imposed in all of the circumstances of the present case is inconsistent with the range of sentences customarily imposed, and the recognition that sentences for home burglary need to be firmed up.</p> <p>At [30] ... The burglary was committed on what the respondent knew to be a residence at which people were present, when it was occupied by a family which included two children. Not only was the respondent armed with a dangerous weapon ..., but the weapon was an axe capable of inflicting very serious injury if used. Moreover, the respondent held the axe to the victim's throat in what must have been a terrifying ordeal for her. There was a premeditated, planned and intentional intimidation of the victim. The respondent was accompanied by two men who were there to provide 'muscle' and the men</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

					<p>forced entry into the house in the very early hrs of the morning. It was also a significant agg factor that the respondent was on bail for the drug offence when the burglary offence was committed.</p> <p>At [42] ... the sentence ... for the agg home burglary offence is so low as to be manifestly inadequate notwithstanding that it was ordered to be served wholly cum with the sentence for the drug offence.</p> <p>At [45] ... The sentence for the agg home burglary offence was substantially less than that which was open on a proper exercise of the sentencing discretion. Appealable error has been very clearly established. ...</p>
11.	<p><i>Italiano v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 115</p> <p>Delivered</p>	<p>48 yrs at time offending. 49 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (20% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history; including drug offending.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Poss methyl 11.7g at 81% purity. Ct 2: Threat to kill.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u> A search warrant executed at Italiano's home located the methyl in a toolbox. Hundreds of unused clip seal bags; a tick list; about 10 g of cannabis and cannabis resin; about 75</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs 3 mths imp. Ct 2: 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 9 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence ct 1.</p> <p>Resentenced (20% discount):</p>

	<p>27/07/2020</p>	<p>Stable upbringing; raised by his parents; three siblings.</p> <p>Performed well academically.</p> <p>Completed motor mechanic apprenticeship; employed this industry most of his adult life; successful business endeavours and investments.</p> <p>Financial difficulties during GFC; 16 yr relationship with partner ended.</p> <p>Cannabis use as a teenager; methyl use from 2012; significant methyl dependence at time sentencing.</p>	<p>cannabis seeds and a knuckle duster were also found.</p> <p>The estimated value of the methyl was between \$5,000 and \$20,000 depending on whether it was sold in point form or by the gram.</p> <p><u>Ct 2</u> Italiano sent his former partner three text messages threatening to kill her, telling her she was going to die and he was going to wait for her at her parents' home.</p> <p>About six days later Italiano was stopped by police within 2 km of his former partner's parents' home. He had driven to Perth from his home in the south of WA.</p> <p>At the time Italiano was subject to a VRO, with his former partner the protected person.</p> <p>Italiano was also on bail for cnt 1 at the time of committing the offence the subject of ct 2.</p>	<p>found the appellant was selling methyl for commercial gain.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the threats were intended to terrify the victim; she believed the appellant was going to kill her and the offending seriously affected her life and kept her away from her own son for fear of making him unsafe as well.</p> <p>No genuine remorse; minimised his offending; blamed the victim for his behaviour; moderate, if not higher, risk of reoffending.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs imp. Ct 2: 1 yr 4 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 4 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [53] The appellant's offending was serious. It involved the poss, wiss, ... of methyl with a high degree of purity. The appellant was a dealer as well as a user of the drug. The appellant was selling methyl for commercial gain. Dealers in methyl who are also addicted to the drug are not treated more leniently merely because the motive for there is wholly or in part the need for money to finance their addiction. The poss of methyl wiss for the purpose of financing an addiction or reducing a drug debt is not mitigatory. It still involves selling or supplying a prohibited drug for a commercial purpose. ...</p> <p>At [57] ... The sentence imposed ... would have</p>
--	-------------------	---	--	---	---

					been within the range open on a proper exercise of the sentencing discretion if the appellant had been convicted after a trial, but not in circumstances where he had PG and was afforded a 20% discount for the plea.
10.	<p>Hayward v The State of Western Australia</p> <p>[2020] WASCA 57</p> <p>Delivered 17/04/2020</p>	<p>44 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount cts 1 and 7; 20% discount all other cts).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; prior att armed robbery conviction and many offences involving dishonesty and violence.</p> <p>Disadvantaged and difficult childhood; parents separated when young; little or nothing to do with his father; violent stepfather who abused alcohol.</p> <p>Left school aged 15 yrs.</p> <p>Poor work history.</p> <p>Entrenched drug use; long history of alcohol and drug issues; commenced drinking aged 11 yrs and methyl aged 13 yrs; long-standing user of heroin.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Act with intent to harm. Cts 2 & 3: Stealing. Ct 4: Armed robbery. Cts 5 & 6: Threat to harm. Cts 7 & 8: Being armed. Ct 9: Att armed robbery.</p> <p>The victim was Hayward's ex-partner. They agreed to meet and an argument developed between them.</p> <p>During the argument Hayward slapped the victim's mobile phone out of her hand, before producing a small hammer. He then struck her a number of times to the head, causing her to fall. As she lay on the ground Hayward got on top of her and continued hitting her with the hammer. He then left.</p> <p>The victim was treated for a laceration and bruises to her head, bruises to her neck area and grazes and cuts to her arms and shoulder (ct 1).</p> <p>Hayward then went a shopping centre complex where he stole two shoes from a</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: no penalty. Ct 3: no penalty. Ct 4: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 5: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 6: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 7: 10 mths imp (conc). Ct 8: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 9: 2 yrs imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 10 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that violent offending was not uncharacteristic of the appellant and his most recent offending demonstrated a continued attitude of disobedience of the law.</p>	<p>Appeal allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence ct 4 and totality principle.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: no penalty. Ct 3: no penalty. Ct 4: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 5: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 6: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 7: 10 mths imp (conc). Ct 8: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 9: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [30] Regardless of whether the offence may be characterised as</p>

			<p>store (ct 2). A short time later he also stole a pair of socks, some underwear; a shopping bag and a soft drink from another store (ct 3).</p> <p>Hayward then entered a pharmacy within the same shopping centre and asked about prescription medication. As the assistant and pharmacist were searching for the medication behind the counter Hayward walked around and stood behind them. He then raised the hammer and demanded Valium. He was given six boxes of the drug. A third staff member attempted to distract Hayward, but he pushed past her (ct 4).</p> <p>After leaving the pharmacy a security officer and a store manager approached Hayward and followed him into a carpark. He raised the hammer in their direction and told them to bugger off and leave him alone. He also threatened to hurt them (cts 5, 6 7).</p> <p>A short time later Hayward approached a 19-yr old female in the carpark of a leisure centre. As she was making a call on her mobile phone he asked her whether she was calling the police. As he did so he held the hammer above his waist whilst standing less than a metre from her. Fearing for her welfare she showed him her mobile to reveal she was speaking to a friend (ct 8).</p> <p>Hayward then entered a fast-food store and placed and paid for an order. While waiting for his food he asked a staff member whether</p>	<p>Demonstrated lack of remorse; very significant risk of reoffending in a violent way.</p>	<p>unsophisticated or committed on the spur of the moment, it was clearly a relatively serious example of its type. The appellant was armed with, and brandished, a potentially dangerous weapon, being the hammer. He was intoxicated on drugs and his actions were erratic. Such circumstances gave rise to the potential for unintended, and possibly serious, consequences. Although [he] did not actually use the hammer, he pushed one of the pharmacist's assistants after obtaining the Valium.</p> <p>At [31] ... pharmacies ... are vulnerable targets to the kind of offending engaged in by the appellant because they store addictive medications. Pharmacies and those who work in them require protection. ...</p> <p>At [46] ... we are not persuaded that the sentence of ... imp for ct 4 was outside the range of a proper exercise of the</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

			<p>he could borrow some money. This request was refused so he demanded \$200 saying he had a fully-loaded pistol. Two staff members told him to leave. He then offered to sell the staff member some of his Valium tablets for \$50. When this offer was declined he produced the hammer. He then left the store (ct 9).</p> <p>Hayward was arrested a short time later, carrying the hammer; some of the stolen items and some of the Valium tablets.</p>		<p>sentencing discretion. ... The sentence ... was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p> <p>At [49] It is plain that the appellant's overall offending, viewed in its entirety, was very serious. ...</p> <p>At [55] ... all of the appellant's offending occurred over a short period of time. ... The TES imposed ... was, in our respectful view, more than what was required to achieve these stated sentencing aims. Thus, the TES imposed ... infringed the first limb of the totality principle. ...</p>
9.	<p><i>NPA v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA 131</p> <p>Delivered 02/08/2018</p>	<p>29 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial (acquitted cts 1-3 & 6).</p> <p>Minor criminal history.</p> <p>Good family support.</p> <p>Completed yr 12; average student.</p> <p>Strong work history; employed while</p>	<p>Cts 4-5; 8-10: Agg sex pen. Ct 7: Att agg sex pen. Ct 11: Threat to kill.</p> <p>NPA and the victim were in a relationship and lived together. NPA was controlling and manipulative and their relationship was described as 'on again, off again'.</p> <p>The offending occurred on three distinct occasions over a period of about 10 months.</p>	<p>Cts 4 & 5: 6 yrs imp (cum). Ct 7: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 8 & 10: 6 yrs imp (conc). Ct 9: 4 yrs imp (conc). Ct 11: 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES: 12 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>Willingness to engage in</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned totality principle. Individual sentences not challenged.</p> <p>At [52] The appellant's offending is properly characterised as appalling. ... It involved multiple acts of penetration without consent, and a further</p>

		<p>studying full time.</p> <p>New partner at time sentencing.</p> <p>Suffers depression and anxiety.</p>	<p>NPA and the victim were separated. The victim agreed to meet NPA and afterwards she invited him to her home. When she told NPA it was time he left he told her 'you know what I'm here for and I'm not leaving without it'. He called her names, pushed her onto a couch and had sexual intercourse with her.</p> <p>The victim tried to escape in her car, but NPA got into the front seat. She was crying and shaking. After driving him to a store she was able to convince NPA to get out of the vehicle.</p> <p>The second incident lasted eight or nine hours, during which time the victim was too scared to call anyone.</p> <p>The victim was at home when NPA texted her. She then saw him entering her backyard so she ran inside, locked the doors and watched him on the home's security cameras. NPA tried to force entry into the house before leaving. She then fled her home.</p> <p>The victim returned home. On the security cameras she noticed NPA had also returned. He entered through an unlocked door. They talked and she confirmed the relationship was over. Calling her names, he pushed her aggressively onto a couch and had sexual intercourse with her.</p> <p>NPA attempted to again sexually penetrate</p>	<p>counselling and therapy; no demonstrated remorse.</p> <p>Moderate to high risk of reoffending.</p> <p>Victim suffered enormous emotional turmoil as a result of the offending.</p>	<p>offence of att sex pen without consent. ... The appellant used non-sexual violence and physical force to facilitate his offending. ... In the course of committing the offences the appellant taunted and threatened the complainant, using insulting and degrading language. This compounded his disregard for her bodily autonomy and dignity. ... He used acts of sex pen without consent, in combination with physical violence, taunting of her, insulting and degrading language and threats, to attempt to assert his control over her. ... The ... offending has had a significant ongoing detrimental psychological effect on the complainant. ...</p> <p>At [55] ... It was appropriate that there was some substantial accumulation of the sentences for the offences for each of the three incidents.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>the victim, but she was able to stop him by gouging him in the eye. He then assaulted her, gagging her so she had difficulty breathing. He again tried, unsuccessfully, to penetrate her with his penis.</p> <p>Over the course of the day NPA continued to assault, abuse and threaten the victim. He again sexually penetrating her, twice with his penis and once with his fingers.</p> <p>After this incident the victim went to live with her parents and their relationship resumed.</p> <p>NPA accused the victim of sleeping with other people and threatened to kill her. In the early hrs of the following day NPA told the victim he was on his way to her home, so her mother and stepfather barricaded the house. On arrival NPA knocked on a window and threatened to smash it. He was arrested at the property.</p>		<p>At [57] ... it cannot be said that the TES imposed on the appellant reveals implied error.</p>
8.	<p><i>Salkild v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 168</p> <p>Delivered 15/09/2017</p>	<p>26 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Substantial criminal history; including agg armed robbery; arson; agg burglary; agg stalking and breach of VRO.</p> <p>Dysfunctional childhood; violent and abusive father; raised by grandmother</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u></p> <p>1 x Threat to kill.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>1 x Stealing. 7 x Breach of protective bail conditions. 1 x Breach of bail. 8 x Breach of VRO. 1 x Poss stolen property. 1 x Fraud. 1 x Breach of police order.</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u></p> <p>9 mths imp (cum).</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>1 x Stealing: 3 mths imp (conc). 7 x Breach of protective bail: 6 mths imp each charge (13801/16 cum all other charges conc). Breach of bail: 3 mths</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appellant appealed length of individual sentences for breach of VRO and breach of protective bail condition; appeal concerned totality and finding of no remorse.</p> <p>At [58] ... In determining whether an offender is</p>

		<p>after parents separated.</p> <p>Expelled from high school for violence.</p> <p>History of intermittent employment; semi-skilled and unskilled work.</p> <p>History of substance abuse; alcohol from aged 13 yrs; methyl from mid-teens.</p>	<p>Salkilld and the victim were in a relationship about three week and lived together. The offences occurred over three days, shortly after the relationship ended.</p> <p><u>Breach of police order</u> Police were called to the house following a confrontation between Salkilld and the victim. He was issued a police order, but returned the same day. A minor altercation occurred before he left.</p> <p>The victim obtained a VRO against him.</p> <p><u>Fraud</u> Several days later Salkilld booked into a bed and breakfast using a false name and tried to pay using a stolen credit card.</p> <p><u>Poss stolen property</u> Salkilld was later arrested, he was found in possession of stolen concession and bank cards in other people's names.</p> <p><u>Breach of bail</u> Salkilld was bailed to appear in the Magistrates Court and failed to appear on the date specified.</p> <p>A condition of bail prohibited him contacting the victim and coming within 75 m of her home.</p> <p><u>Breach of VRO and protective bail</u></p>	<p>imp (conc). 1 x Breach VRO (12875/15): 9 mths imp (cum). 7 x Breach VRO: 6 mths imp each charge (conc). 1 x Poss stolen property: 4 mths imp (conc). 1 x Fraud: 3 mths imp (conc). 1 x Breach of police order: 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 2 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending relentless and characterised the text messages as extremely threatening and vicious and that the appellant referred multiple times to an impending plan to shoot the victim and his harassment of the victim was not confined to only three days.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant had repeatedly been undeterred by police orders; a VRO and</p>	<p>remorseful, a sentencing judge is entitled to have regard to the offender's conduct as a whole.</p> <p>At [59] ... The psychologist's statement that the appellant accepted a reasonable level of responsibility for his offending is not to be equated with remorse for the effect of his offending on the victim. ...</p> <p>At [63] ... The appellant's conduct in breaching the VRO was not isolated or a momentary lapse. It was a sustained course of intentional conduct. The communications ... contained a series of abusive threats to the effect that the appellant intended to kill or maim the complainant. ... The threats were conveyed with a powerful sense of imminence and immediacy. They were intended to terrify ... These features of the appellant's offence meant that it was a very serious example of an</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p><u>conditions</u> Over two days Salkilld contacted the victim, calling and sending her many text messages of a threatening and frightening nature.</p> <p>Salkilld also rode a motorcycle past the victim's home several times over the course of a few hours. Later that night he again rode past the house and stopped briefly about 20m from the unit.</p> <p><u>Indictment – Threat to kill</u> In the first text message he threatened to shoot and torture the victim.</p> <p><u>Stealing</u> Salkilld stole two mobile phones from Australia Post.</p>	<p>protective bail conditions and it revealed how relentlessly driven he was.</p> <p>Uncooperative with police; no acceptance of responsibility; no genuine remorse shown.</p> <p>Medium risk of future violent offending.</p>	<p>offence against s 61(1) of the <i>Restraining Orders Act</i>.</p> <p>At [72] The appellant's breach of the protective bail conditions ... was not an isolated breach. Rather, it was part of a course of conduct by which the appellant deliberately breached the conditions of his bail. ... Moreover, in the context of the threatening communications ... the appellant's conduct was intended to intimidate ...</p> <p>At [78] ... the offence of threatening to kill, was a serious offence ... While the threat was not made while the appellant and complainant were face to face, the tone and text of the threat conveyed its immediacy. That threat was by no means isolated. To the contrary, the appellant's offending reflected in the other charges persisted for more than two days.</p> <p>At [83] We do not accept that all of the appellant's</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					offences, or even all of his offences of breach of protective bail conditions, breach of VRO and threaten to kill can be characterised as constituting a single invasion of the same legally protected interest
7.	<p><i>Cummins v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 135</p> <p>Delivered 20/07/2017</p>	<p>31 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Lengthy prior criminal history; previous offences of stealing a motor vehicle and reckless driving; first custodial sentence aged 17; most of his adult life spent in prison; difficulties with reintegration.</p> <p>Average childhood; supportive parents; family home free from abuse or illicit substance use; currently not close to his family.</p> <p>Left school aged 13; worked as plasterers apprentice; not employed since aged 17.</p> <p>Father of three children to two partners; first relationship characterised by illicit substance use and domestic violence; current partner supportive and disapproving of illicit substance use.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Steal motor vehicle. Ct 2: Steal motor vehicle drive recklessly. Ct 3: Threats with intent to compel. Ct 4: Att steal motor vehicle. Ct 5: Burglary. Ct 6: Steal motor vehicle drive recklessly.</p> <p>Cummins met the owner of a motor vehicle advertised for sale. Following a test drive he drove off in the car at high speed (ct 1).</p> <p>Several days later Cummins was seen driving the stolen car. Police requested he stop by activating their vehicle's emergency lights and siren, but he accelerated away at high speed. To evade police he weaved in and out of traffic at high speed, crossed to the incorrect side of the road, failed to observe a stop sign and drove through a busy intersection, forcing other cars to brake heavily to avoid a collision (ct 2).</p> <p>In the hour following Cummins was involved in a number of crashes whilst driving the stolen car. Armed with a samurai sword in a sheath he got out of the car and hit cars as</p>	<p>Ct 1: 18 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 3 yrs 6 mths imp. Ct 3: 2 yrs 4 mths imp (conc). Ct 4: 8 mths imp (cum on ct 2). Ct 5: 2 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 6: 3 yrs 8 mths imp (cum on ct 2).</p> <p>TES 7 yrs 10 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>Ct 4 reduced from 12 mths to 8 mths imp on totality principle.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the theft of the car the subject of ct 1 a premeditated and planned theft.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned totality.</p> <p>At [41] ... Clearly this was an extremely serious course of criminal conduct. The driving-related offences involved highly dangerous actions that put the lives of many members of the public at risk. In both instances, the driving persisted and was agg by the fact the appellant was seeking to flee from police and that he had no authority to drive. The threat charge was also a very serious offence That offence was agg not only by the terms of the threat, but that it was accompanied by use of a highly dangerous weapon that was wielded in a menacing way and that</p>

		<p>Significant use of illicit drugs; commenced using methyl aged 13; heavily under the influence of drugs at time of offending.</p>	<p>they past, attempting to open the doors of cars, before they sped off. He then ran towards the victim and yelled for him to give him his car keys. Pulling the sword from its sheath he pointed it at the victim, demanding his car keys or he would chop his head off. Out of fear the victim dropped his keys for him to take (ct 3).</p> <p>Using the keys Cummins attempted to start the victim's vehicle. Unable to do so he chased the victim to a house whilst brandishing the samurai sword, striking the front door before running off (ct 4).</p> <p>Cummins jumped into the rear yard of a neighbouring property. Entering the home through an unlocked door he stole the keys to a vehicle, got into the car parked in the driveway and driving off at speed (ct 5).</p> <p>A short time later he was seen by police driving the stolen vehicle. He failed to stop and accelerated away at high speed when requested to stop. He weaved in and out of heavy traffic, causing vehicles to brake heavily to avoid being hit. He drove through a busy shopping centre carpark at high speed, crossed to the incorrect side of the road, through red traffic lights and rammed numerous vehicles in order to escape police. His vehicle was eventually intercepted by a police and he was arrested.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge described the appellant's driving as appalling and that he 'selfishly put the lives and safety of other road users at significant risk'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found ct 3 was a very serious offence; being armed with a sword lent credence to the threat.</p> <p>Appellant at high risk of committing further serious offences; remorseful and insight into the seriousness of his offending.</p>	<p>the appellant pursued the complainant whilst brandishing the weapon.</p> <p>At [58] ... it is relevant to consider the sentences imposed on the individual cts. In this regard, other cases dealing with offences of agg stealing of a motor vehicle ... that are relevant ... demonstrate that the sentences imposed on cts 2 and 6 were within the customary discretionary range for offences of this nature and this level of seriousness. There is nothing to suggest that the sentences imposed for the threat offence, ct 3, or the burglary offence, ct 5, were outside the customary range for those offences.</p>
6.	Pureau v The State of Western	24 yrs at time offending. 26 yrs at time sentencing.	Ct 3: Threat to kill. Ct 4: Agg AOBH.	Ct 3: 3 yrs imp (cum). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).	Dismissed.

<p>Australia</p> <p>[2017] WASCA 115</p> <p>Delivered 26/06/2017</p>	<p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Born in NZ; arrived in Australia aged 17 yrs.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; including a conviction of AOBH in a domestic setting.</p> <p>Employed plasterer.</p> <p>No illicit substance or alcohol use.</p>	<p>Ct 5: Dep lib.</p> <p>The victim, M, was several wks pregnant and had been in a relationship with the appellant approx 6 wks. They shared a home with three other people.</p> <p>M left to attend appointments, borrowing appellant's mobile phone and car. When she returned he was angry with her for being away for so long. They argued and he abused and spat in M's face. She called out for someone to call the police, however other occupants did not do so as illicit substances were in the house.</p> <p>Appellant left the house. Other occupants bound M with tape and assaulted her. Bulk of injuries caused by others.</p> <p>Appellant returned. Armed with a knife and taser and wearing gloves, he ordered M into a room and told her he was going to kill her. He pointed the knife and threatened her with the taser, telling her the more she screamed the more pain he would inflict. He att to taser M in the face but she raised her arms to protect herself, the taser cut her thumb.</p> <p>Appellant pulled M's hair and dragged her from room. She was subjected to further threats and assaults before she was able to escape.</p> <p>Between everyone involved, ordeal lasted</p>	<p>Ct 5: 3 yrs imp (cum). TES 6 yrs imp. EFP.</p> <p>The judge found appellant's overall offending constituted a very serious example of domestic violence and the real seriousness of the offence was his threats to unlawfully kill M and the deprivation of liberty. The real harm was psychological.</p> <p>Appellant denied the offending.</p> <p>Lack of remorse and genuine empathy.</p>	<p>Appeal challenged the individual sentences on cts 3 and 5 and concerned totality.</p> <p>At [75] ... M was defenceless and particularly vulnerable by reason of the greater physical strength of the appellant and her pregnancy. The offences occurred in a domestic setting. The fact that the offences were committed in such a setting increases the seriousness of what the appellant did. It does not matter that their relationship was brief.</p> <p>At [76] ... Although the offences occurred in the one transaction, the imposition of conc sentences would have resulted in a TES that would be an inadequate and inappropriate reflection of the overall criminality of the appellant's conduct.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			more than five hrs.		
5.	<p>MacCauley v The State of Western Australia</p> <p>[2017] WASCA 65</p> <p>Delivered 23/03/2017</p>	<p>23 yrs at time offending. 24 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (20%).</p> <p>Short criminal history; prior weapon and breach VRO convictions.</p> <p>Parents separated aged 5 yrs.</p> <p>Born in NZ; moved to Australia with her mother as a child and lived 'a transient life'.</p> <p>Tenuous relationship with her mother, a substance abuser; close to her two sisters.</p> <p>Left home at 14 yrs.</p> <p>In a new relationship at time sentencing.</p> <p>Commenced abusing alcohol and illicit substances at an early age.</p>	<p><u>Ind</u> Ct 1: Crim damage. Ct 2: Agg burg (dwelling). Ct 3: Threat to kill.</p> <p><u>Section 32 notice</u> Ch 1: Agg assault. Ch 2: Breach VRO. Ch 3: Breach bail.</p> <p>MacCauley and victim 2 had been in a relationship. The victim had custody of their young son and lived with his mother, victim 1.</p> <p>A VRO was in place protecting the victim's mother from MacCauley.</p> <p>MacCauley, distressed by difficulties in seeing her son consulted a GP, who diagnosed panic disorder, social anxiety and stress/adjustment disorder. She was medicated and placed on a treatment plan.</p> <p>The following day MacCauley, in company with police, attended victim 1's property to take possession of a car. Due to a dispute over ownership of the vehicle police were unable to assist. MacCauley became upset and refused further police assistance.</p> <p>After police left MacCauley smashed six windows and entered victim 1's house. She attempted to strike victim 2 with a mirror and</p>	<p><u>Ind</u> Ct 1: 9 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 2 yrs imp. Ct 3: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>Section 32 notice</u> Ch 1: No further penalty. Ch 2: No further penalty. Ch 3: 1 mth imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 2 yrs imp. EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge described the offending as very serious. He accepted that at the time of the offending the appellant was suffering from an adjustment disorder and was experiencing stress and, on the balance of probabilities, she found it difficult to make calm and rational choices and was disinhibited in her behaviour due to her heightened emotional state.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned new psychiatric evidence.</p> <p>Re-sentenced.</p> <p>Ct 1: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 18 mths imp. Ct 3: 9 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 18 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [42] ... diagnosis of adjustment disorder was incorrect. Rather, the appellant was suffering from a moderately severe major depressive disorder... 'considerable causal relationship' between the depressive disorder and her offending.</p> <p>At [51] Although the disorder did not deprive the appellant of her ability to discern right from wrong, or of her ability to form an intent, it is now apparent that the appellant's mental state was a mitigating</p>

			<p>threatened to kill both victims and herself. Picking up a shard of glass she threatened victim 1, lunging at him a number of times. Outside, MacCauley used a shovel to damage a vehicle belonging to victim 1.</p> <p>Restrained until police arrived MacCauley was taken for medical treatment as she displayed and expressed suicidal intent.</p> <p>MacCauley was bailed to appear in the Magistrate's Court but failed to attend.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found no evidence the appellant suffered any recognised psychiatric disorder.</p>	<p>factor of greater significance than the sentencing judge was in the position to assess.</p>
4.	<p><i>Cleminson v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 58</p> <p>Delivered 15/03/2017</p>	<p>25 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Lengthy criminal history; including convictions for agg AOBH and common assault.</p> <p>Childhood 'fairly dysfunctional'.</p> <p>Completed yr 12.</p> <p>Irregular employment history.</p> <p>Father of a six-yr-old child; no contact with his ex-partner and child.</p> <p>History of alcohol and drug abuse.</p>	<p><u>Ind</u></p> <p>Ct 1 & 3: Criminal damage. Ct 2: Threat to kill. Ct 4: Armed to cause fear. Ct 5: Poss firearms. Ct 6: Assault public officer.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>Ch 1: Discharging a firearm. Ch 2: Refusing a disease test.</p> <p>The victims are Cleminson's mother KC, and her partner GJ. They lived in a family and domestic relationship on an isolated property.</p> <p>Agitated Cleminson took some of his belongings and set fire to them. The fire was extinguished. He said 'I'm going to kill everyone'. Inside he smashed items, including two power boxes to the house and shed, cutting off the main power supply.</p> <p>KC left the property but GJ remained and hid</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 3: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 5: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 6: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>Ch 1: 6 mths imp (conc). Ch 2: 2 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 2 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge described the overall offending as very serious and found the offending was not</p>	<p>Dismissed – on papers.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence for ct 4 and totality.</p> <p>At [26] ... Although the offences were committed on the same day in one (extended) incident, some accumulation of the sentences was appropriate in order to properly reflect the appellant's overall criminality.</p>

			<p>outside, too frightened to go into the house.</p> <p>Cleminson said on several occasions ‘You fucking cunts, I’m going to kill yous’. He unlocked a gun safe and removed two firearms, forced entry to a box of ammunition and loaded one of the rifles. Outside he fired a round into a target. He did not hold a firearms licence or permit.</p> <p>Police arrived and he submitted himself, unarmed, to police. As he was being assisted into the police vehicle he spat in the face of a police officer. A mixture of saliva and blood hit the officer in the eyes. He refused to undergo a mandatory blood test.</p>	<p>uncharacteristic of the appellant.</p> <p>Lacks insight into causes of his offending behaviour; elevated risk of re-offending.</p>	
3.	<p><i>Bloomfield v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 10</p> <p>Delivered 18/01/2017</p>	<p>28 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (20% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history.</p> <p>Injured in MV accident aged 10-11; possible neurological damage.</p> <p>Gifted student; behavioural problems; left school year 11.</p> <p>Employed; labouring roles.</p> <p>Significantly affected by the death of his father.</p> <p>Use of drug and alcohol from an early</p>	<p><u>Ind</u></p> <p>Ct 1: Threats to kill. Ct 2: Armed in circ likely to cause fear. Ct 3: Damage. Ct 4: Steal motor vehicle. Ct 5: Stealing.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>Ch 1: Poss prohibited weapon. Ch 2: Wilful drove motor vehicle in a dangerous manner. Chs 3&12: DUI. Chs 4&8: No authority to drive. Ch 5: Poss cannabis. Ch 6: Agg unlawful assault. Ch 7&11: Refusing to stop. Ch 9: Breach bail. Ch 10: Poss drug paraphernalia and cannabis.</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 9 mths imp (conc). Ct 4: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 5: 9 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>Ch 1: 4mths imp (conc). Ch 2: 6 mths imp (conc). MDL disq 12 mths. Ch 3: 4 mths imp (conc); MDL disq 30 mths. Ch 4: 9 mths imp (conc); MDL disq 12</p>	<p>Allowed (life disq and disq on ch 2, otherwise dismissed).</p> <p>Appellant challenged MDL life disq for ch 12; appealed length of sentence for ch 11 and concerned totality.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u></p> <p>Re-sentenced on ch 12 to: MDL disq 30 mths. Cum with disq on ch 4, 8 & 11. On ch 2 disq reduced to 9 mths (conc).</p> <p>Total disq 78 mths.</p> <p>At [15] The sentencing</p>

		<p>age. Using daily at time of offending.</p> <p>Mental health issues associated with substance abuse; deeply entrenched paranoid beliefs.</p>	<p><u>Ind</u> Bloomfield was visiting his mother when he became aggressive and abusive. Told to leave he grabbed a knife and held it to her throat, repeatedly telling her he was going to bash and kill her.</p> <p>Bloomfield left and returned a short time later, re-entered the house and punched a hole in the door. When his mother tried to leave he head butted her and squeezed the back of her neck. He smashed a window and stole \$600 cash and a scooter and damaged a gate as he left.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u> Bloomfield was driving at high speed. When asked to stop he drove erratically at speeds up to 126km per hr and swerved in and out of traffic. He was found in possession of a knuckleduster and had a BAC of 1.77. At the time he was disq from driving.</p> <p>On a personal bail undertaking Bloomfield failed to appear in the Magistrate's Court.</p> <p>Bloomfield was driving at high speed. To evade police he increased his speed and drove at up to 140km per hour and through a red light. Other vehicles were forced to brake and take evasive action. He eventually collided with another vehicle and struck traffic control lights. A search located cannabis and a smoking implement in the glovebox. He had a BAC of 0.200 and his</p>	<p>mths. Ch 5: 3 mths imp (conc). Ch 6: 3 mths (cum). Ch 7: 3 mths imp (conc); MDL disq 2 yrs. Ch 8: 12 mths imp (conc); MDL disq 12 mths. Chs 9-10: 4 mths imp (conc). Ch 11: 2 yrs 6 mths imp (cum); MDL disq 2 yrs. Ch 12: 6 mths imp (conc); MDL disq life.</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 9 mths imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge characterised the threat to kill and reckless driving as serious examples of those offences. Armed with a knife he had the means to carry out the threat and his driving was 'appalling'.</p> <p>Considered his mental health problems and accepted he experienced paranoid delusions at time of offending.</p>	<p>judge made no order for accumulation of the periods of disq on [ch 12] ... the <i>Sentencing Act</i> provides that an order disqualifying an offender from holding or obtaining a driver's licence is to be conc with any other term for which the offender's licence is or may be disq or suspended unless the court orders that the term is to be cum on those terms.</p> <p>At [19] the sentence on ch 11 could be characterised as high but does not disclose error.</p> <p>At [68] ... the appellant's offending was so serious that the TES would not infringe that principle even if the sentence for the agg reckless driving offence had been held to have been manifestly excessive. The appellant committed multiple serious offences that involved persistent and violent aggression against his mother and a significant risk to members of public on more than one occasion.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

			MDL was disq.	Remorseful, moderate risk of further offending.	
2.	<i>FWB v The State of Western Australia</i> [2016] WASCA 118 Delivered 11/07/2016	<p>47 yrs at time sentencing. 42-44 yrs at time offending for indictment 1.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (20% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history; no prior sexual offending.</p> <p>Left school aged 15 yrs.</p> <p>Recent steady employment.</p> <p>Regularly consumes alcohol and occasionally smokes cannabis. Daily use of amphetamines and heroin, but did not believe he had a substance abuse problem.</p> <p>FWB on bail for indictment 1 at time offending on indictment 2.</p>	<p><u>Ind 1</u> Ct 1-4, 6-10: Sex pen of de facto child U 16 yrs. Ct 5: Indec dealings with de facto child U 16 yrs.</p> <p><u>Ind 2</u> Ct 1: Dep lib. Ct 2: Threat to kill. Ct 3: Agg sex pen. Ct 4: GBH with intent.</p> <p><u>Ind 1</u> FWB had been the de facto father of the victim, M, since she was about 2 yrs old.</p> <p>When M was aged 11-12 yrs, FWB digitally penetrated her vagina twice (ct 1-2). He then penetrated her vagina with his penis (ct 3). He slapped M's face when she tried to escape. FWB then made M suck his penis, before masturbating and ejaculating on her face (ct 4). Later, M awoke with FWB touching her vagina (ct 5). The following night, FWB went into M's bedroom and had sexual intercourse with her (ct 6).</p> <p>When M was aged 12-13 yrs, FWB filmed himself sexually abusing M over two hrs. FWB put his fingers in her vagina (ct 7) and then had sexual intercourse with her (ct 8). FWB made M suck his penis (ct 9), before having sexual intercourse with her again (ct</p>	<p><u>Ind 1</u> Ct 1-2 and 7: 2 yrs imp each (conc). Ct 3, 6 and 10: 6 yrs imp each (conc). Ct 4 and 9: 4 yrs imp each (conc). Ct 5: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 8: 6 yrs (cum ct 3).</p> <p>TES 12 yrs imp (cum with TES on indictment 2).</p> <p><u>Ind 2</u> Ct 1: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 2: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 3: 8 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 5 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 8 yrs imp (cum with TES on indictment 1).</p> <p>Overall TES 20 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge described the offending against M as involving "the most gross breach of trust" and "at or near</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned totality.</p> <p>Only re-sentenced on <u>indictment 1</u> to:</p> <p>Ct 8: 6 yrs imp (cum with 2 yrs on ct 1).</p> <p>TES 8 yrs imp (cum with TES on indictment 2).</p> <p>TES 16 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [65] The charges in the first indictment were representative of a course of conduct.</p> <p>At [66]... in relation to the first indictment...The two episodes of offending involved planning and premeditation...The offending occurred in the family home, a relatively isolated farmhouse, where M was vulnerable and the appellant could abuse her for an extended period</p>

			<p>10). FWB continued the abuse and repeated the acts until he ejaculated onto her stomach. M was crying and was fearful of FWB who threatened to harm her or members of her family.</p> <p><u>Ind 2</u> FWB and H (M's mother) had been in a de facto relationship for 13 yrs, but had separated approx. 6 mths earlier.</p> <p>The dep lib charge (ct 1) was a continuing offence. When visiting H, FWB produced a knife and threatened to kill her, telling her that he loved her, couldn't live without her and wanted her to suffer like she had made him suffer (ct 2). FWB tied H's wrists with cable ties, forced her into a car and drove her to the vicinity of a country town. FWB ordered H out of the vehicle, removed her clothing had sexual intercourse with her until he ejaculated (ct 3). FWB stabbed H in the chest (ct 4) and during the struggle she cut her finger on the knife. When H got out of the car FWB dragged her by the hair back into the car. FWB said he was taking her for medical assistance but H feared for her safety and jumped from the moving car and ran to a nearby house. As a result of being stabbed H suffered a 5cm wound that caused one of her lungs to collapse.</p>	<p>the top of the range of gravity, justifying the maximum penalty as a starting point".</p> <p>Offending occurred when M was alone and FWB sometimes engineered opportunities to be alone with her. The sentencing judge said that the offending against M had features of sex pen without consent; offending was not the result of grooming.</p> <p>FWB's offending against H "was a terrifying ordeal" and involved "criminality of the highest degree".</p> <p>FWB was at a moderate to high risk of future sexual offending and a moderate risk of future violent offending, most likely family violence.</p>	<p>without fear of being discovered...The appellant filmed the offences the subject of cts 7, 8, 9 and 10. He had previously told M that once he had recorded the abuse he would stop offending against her. That was not the case... The appellant's offending against M's mother... would have adversely affected M in view of the threats to harm her family which the appellant made in the course of his offending against M.</p> <p>At [69] The appellant claimed to have little or no recollection of the offending and, accordingly, little weight could be given to any remorse. No victim empathy was apparent.</p> <p>At [70] the TES of 12 yrs' imp, especially in the context of the PG, was not broadly consistent with reasonably comparable cases and was not commensurate with the overall seriousness of the offending... The proper</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>exercise of the sentencing discretion required lesser accumulation of the individual sentences.</p> <p>At [90] ...the TES of 8 yrs' imp for the offences in the second indictment was...well within the range open to the sentencing judge ... and reflects ... totality issues arising as a result of the appellant standing for sentence not only in relation to the offences in the second indictment but also the offences in the first indictment.</p> <p>At [91] the overall TES of 20 yrs' imp in relation to the first and second indictments, especially in the context of the PG, was not commensurate with the overall seriousness of the offending the subject of the first and second indictments.</p>
1.	<p><i>Fletcher v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2014] WASCA</p>	<p>38 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Lengthy criminal record including</p>	<p>1 x AOBH.</p> <p>1 x Stealing.</p> <p>1 x Threats to kill.</p> <p>The appellant believed his partner was</p>	<p>16 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>8 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 2 yrs imp.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>(Mazza dissenting as to reasons in respect of ground 2).</p>

<p>219</p> <p>Delivered 21/12/2014</p>	<p>convictions for violent offending.</p> <p>Regularly employed.</p> <p>Committed these offences shortly after being released to parole and the day after his parole was cancelled; Fled to Qld; Extradited to WA and served balance of sentence.</p> <p>On bail for these offences but cancelled as a result of failure to attend court.</p> <p>Co-offender Clinton Lucas convicted of AOBH and stealing and fined \$4000 for AOBH and \$1000 for stealing. Fine payable to victim.</p>	<p>having a relationship with another. The appellant telephoned his partner and threatened and abused her, demanding to know where he would find the victim. She declined to provide the information. The appellant arranged for his co-offender to go to a gymnasium where the victim frequented. Either the appellant or co-offender punched the victim to the side of the face. The victim suffered bruising and tenderness to his jaw, fell into the garden and dropped his bag. Both offenders found the bag and the co-offender picked it up and left.</p> <p>The appellant telephoned his partner on occasions, including an occasion when the appellant told her he had “sorted out” the victim. The appellant made threats to his partner that he was going to tie her to a chair, douse her with petrol and set fire to her. The appellant did not intend to carry out the threat. It was made to intimidate and overbear his partner’s will and it had that effect.</p>	<p>EFP.</p> <p>Significant delay in proceedings.</p> <p>No PSR or Psychological Reports before the Sentencing Judge.</p>	<p>Re-sentenced to a total of 16 mths imp.</p> <p>At [25] Unjustifiable disparity is an appealable error although it may not always lead to an appeal being allowed and if allowed, identity of punishment in resentencing is not required.</p> <p>At [32] There is in my view an unjustifiable disparity in the type of sentences imposed on the co-offenders because a fine for the co-offender is the wrong type of sentence.</p>	
<p><i>Transitional Provisions Repealed (14/01/2009)</i></p>					
<p><i>Transitional Provisions Enacted (31/08/2003)</i></p>					