

Acts or omissions causing bodily harm or danger

s 304 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are separated by a row which shows when the transitional provisions were enacted, and another showing when they were repealed.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:

agg	aggravated
att	attempted
AOBH	assault occasioning bodily harm
burg	burglary
conc	concurrent
cum	cumulative
ct	count
dep lib	deprivation of liberty
EFP	eligible for parole
GBH	grievous bodily harm
imp	imprisonment
PG	plead guilty
susp	suspended
SW	search warrant
TES	total effective sentence
VRO	violence restraining order

s 304(1) Acts/omissions (max penalty 7 yrs imp)

No.	Case	Antecedents	Summary/Facts	Sentence	Appeal
23.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Popal</i></p> <p>[2020] WASCA 200</p> <p>Delivered 26/11/2020</p>	<p>34 yrs at time offending. 37 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (15% discount).</p> <p>No prior criminal history; conviction for reckless driving.</p> <p>Born Afghanistan; lived Australia 17 yrs.</p> <p>Wife; two children; another child with long-term partner.</p> <p>Very supportive family.</p> <p>Good work history; hard worker; earned very good money.</p> <p>Commenced using cannabis in high school; regular user of methyl 2 yrs prior to offending; using methyl with increasing frequency.</p> <p>History of drug-induced psychosis; in a drug-</p>	<p>Cts 1 & 8: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Criminal damage. Cts 3 & 5-6: Act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Cts 4; 7 & 9: Criminal damage. Ct 10: Armed likely to cause fear. Ct 11: Reckless driving.</p> <p>Popal was driving his motor vehicle. He was in possession of a semi-automatic 9 mm handgun, registered in his name, and numerous rounds of ammunition.</p> <p>The victim, AH, was driving his vehicle on the same road and approached Popal's vehicle from behind. Popal pointed the handgun through his side window and backwards towards AH's vehicle. He then discharged three rounds into the sky and a further two rounds through his vehicle's sunroof.</p> <p>A short time later Popal encountered another motorist., the victim GF. Overtaking GF's vehicle he pulled half off the road and stopped, causing GF to slow down to pass. As she did so, he pointed the gun out of his window and discharged it seven times into GF's vehicle. GF had to duck to avoid being struck by the shots fired.</p> <p>A short time later Popal approached a vehicle</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Cts 2; 4; 9-10: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 1 yr 3 mths imp (cum). Cts 5-7: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 8: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 11: 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>MDL disq 2 yrs; firearms licence disq 10 yrs.</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 3 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending 'very serious'; there was the very considerable risk the respondent's conduct may have killed or very seriously physically injured the victims or an innocent passerby.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found but for the respondent's drug-induced psychosis he</p>	<p>Allowed (length of sentences cts 1 & 8 and totality principle).</p> <p>Appeal concerned lengths of individual sentences cts 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 & 11; error in finding respondent of prior good character (cts 1-10) and totality principle.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (conc). Cts 2; 4 & 9: 12 mths imp (conc). Cts 3; 5-6: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 7: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 8: 6 yrs imp (cum). Ct 10: 18 mths imp (cum). Ct 11: 12 mths imp (cum)</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [70] ... As the sentencing judge and defence counsel recognised, there was a</p>

		<p>induced psychosis at time offending.</p>	<p>being driven by the victim, DS. He fired a shot at the vehicle. DS continued to his destination before inspecting his vehicle and noticing a bullet hole.</p> <p>A few minutes later the victims JM and LM (a father and his 16 yr old daughter) were travelling in a vehicle on the same road. Popal discharged two rounds from the firearm, penetrating the tailgate of the vehicle.</p> <p>A short time later Popal fired at least two shots at the victim's CB's vehicle. CB had stopped on the side of the road to take photographs and as she leaned over to pick up her camera, she felt one of the bullets fly past her. The shot went through the vehicle's windscreen and into the driver's seat. Another hit the bonnet and ricocheted into the windscreen.</p> <p>The next day Popal left his home address in his vehicle. He drove at speed and two unmarked police vehicles activated their emergency lights and sirens. He did not stop his vehicle and accelerated in an att to evade the police. He travelled in excess of 140 km p/h in a 70 km p/h zone, through a set of red traffic lights and without slowing down.</p> <p>Popal's vehicle was eventually stopped. He was found to be in possession of a handgun and 192 rounds of ammunition.</p> <p>A search of the two residences used by Popal also located a further 256 rounds of ammunition.</p>	<p>would not have offended, but that this condition was not mitigatory because it was self-inflicted.</p> <p>Psychological effect upon victims profound and enduring.</p> <p>Remorseful; rehabilitation programs undertaken while on remand, including drug and alcohol counselling.</p> <p>Minimal risk of reoffending if continues to not use illicit drugs.</p>	<p>very considerable risk that the respondent's offending conduct may have killed or very seriously physically injured the victims. ... To deliberately create such a risk involves a very high level of criminality.</p> <p>At [71] ... The respondent's actions were sudden and random against victims who were completely unprepared for what occurred, and therefore extremely vulnerable. The respondent was in a psychotic state as a result of his voluntary use of methyl. ... the fact that he was in this self-induced state provides no mitigation whatever. The respondent's conduct was both outrageous and extremely dangerous. Conduct of the kind in which the respondent engaged, ... must be generally deterred and, ordinarily at least, must be met with substantial punishment.</p> <p>At [75] ... the sentences</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

			After his arrest Popal was admitted to Graylands Hospital for treatment for his drug-induced psychosis.		imposed ... on both cts 1 and 8 were manifestly inadequate. The sentences were not merely low or lenient. Each was unreasonable or plainly unjust having regard to the max penalty of 20 yrs' imp, the objectively serious criminality of the offences, the particular need to provide proper punishment and general deterrence, and the mitigation. ...
22.	<i>Forrest v The State of Western Australia</i> [2019] WASCA 172 Delivered 05/11/2019	35 yrs at time offending. 36 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after PG (25% discount). Extensive criminal history; prior convictions for assault. Dysfunctional childhood; subjected to violence and abuse. Completed yr 11. Six children from previous relationships. History of substance abuse;	Ct 1: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Unlawfully did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Forrest and the victims, Lenon and Campbell, were sentenced prisoners. Forrest knew Lenon by reputation and was disgusted by the crime which she had committed. Lenon was standing in a queue, alongside Campbell, when Forrest decided to pour a cup of tea over her. She obtained a container and filled it with hot water. Forrest returned to the queue and, from behind and without warning, poured the hot water onto Lenon. Some of the hot water splashed onto Campbell.	Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc). TES 5 yrs imp. EFP. The sentencing judge found the assault upon Ms Lenon was a 'vigilante' attack; which aggravated the seriousness of the offending. The sentencing judge found the offending agg by premeditation and because she was in custody in respect of other violent offending.	Dismissed. Appeal concerned length of sentence. At [48] The appellant's offending was very serious. The offending was unprovoked and motivated by vigilantism. It involved some premeditation. ... The assault occurred in a custodial setting where prisoners are vulnerable to attack by other prisoners. Ms Lenon suffered significant injuries ... The appellant' offending had the potential to cause Ms Lenon a life-threatening

		<p>commenced using cannabis aged 12 yrs; amphetamine and alcohol use.</p> <p>Suffers various physical and mental illnesses.</p>	<p>Lenon suffered deep dermal second degree burns to 21% of her body. She required specialist care and spent two days in intensive care. Her burns healed without the need for surgery, but she was left with some degree of scarring.</p> <p>Campbell suffered minor burns.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found the potential for harm was far greater than the harm that actually occurred</p> <p>Cooperative; some belated indications of remorse and acceptance of responsibility for her offending.</p>	<p>injury.</p> <p>At [54] ... The sentence was commensurate with the seriousness of the offence after taking into account the maximum penalty of 20 yrs' imp, ... The sentence was reasonably open to his Honour on a proper exercise of his discretion. The sentence was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p>
21.	<p><i>Evans v. The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 73</p> <p>Delivered 17/05/2019</p>	<p>44 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history; two convictions for common assault.</p> <p>Support of family and community.</p> <p>Left school aged 16 yrs; completed apprenticeship.</p> <p>Good work history; high paying position at time offending; well-regarded, very valuable employee.</p> <p>Long term de facto</p>	<p>1 x Unlawfully did an act resulting in bodily harm.</p> <p>The complainant was friends with Evans' stepson, but they had fallen out.</p> <p>Heavily intoxicated, the complainant went to the stepson's home, knocked on the door and demanded he come out. He then damaged the stepson's car using a knife, injuring himself in the process. Police were called, attended and arrested the complainant. Due to his injury and intoxicated state he was taken to hospital where he was later discharged and went home.</p> <p>Later the same day Evans learnt the complainant was not in gaol so he took it upon himself to mete out punishment.</p> <p>Cutting a length of hose to brandish as an</p>	<p>3 yrs imp (partially susp; order for release after serving 1 yr).</p> <p>The trial judge found the attack on the complainant was a planned vigilante assault, done to inflict serious injury and pain as punishment; the assault was carefully planned and conducted against a victim who the appellant knew was in an intoxicated and depressed state earlier in the day.</p> <p>No demonstrated significant remorse.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence (error in sentence structure).</p> <p>Re-sentenced 18 mths imp; susp 12 mths.</p> <p>At [49] ... the bruising and welts sustained by the complainant can fairly be described as 'significant'. ...</p> <p>At [75]-[76] ... the appellant was sentenced prior to the publication of the decision of the court in <i>SJB</i>. While that may make</p>

		<p>relationship; stepfather to three children; 5 yr old son from union; partner suffers long-standing health issues as a result of severe childhood illness.</p> <p>Recognises alcohol played a role in his past and current offending and need to avoid drinking.</p>	<p>offensive weapon, and armed with a Taser, Evans went to the complainant's home and confronted him. Evans thrust the Taser at the complainant a couple of times then repeatedly struck him with the hose. Evans also kicked him in the groin.</p> <p>The complainant sustained significant and widespread welts and bruises over his body, particularly his back, along with significant physical and mental distress.</p>		<p>the trial judge's decision to backdate the sentence more understandable, the decision to backdate remains an error on the approach adopted in <i>SJB</i>. ... It follows that the sentence imposed by the trial judge on the appellant did not accord with the <i>Sentencing Act</i> and involved a material express error of law. It also necessarily follows that a different sentence ... should have been imposed. ... the trial judge erred in backdating the partly susp sentence of imp.</p> <p>At [95] ... Significant agg factors were that the complainant was attacked at his own home, that the offence involved a sustained and premeditated assault with the Taser and hose and that the appellant's conduct involved a vigilante response to the damaging of his stepson's car earlier that day.</p> <p>At [96] The offence is also</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>aggravated by the psychological impact which the offence had on the complainant. ...</p> <p>At [97] The vigilante character of the attack also increases the significance of general deterrence as a sentencing consideration. ...</p>
20.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v. Mae</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA 53</p> <p>Delivered 16/04/2018</p>	<p><u>James</u> 30 yrs at time offending. 32 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG. (cts 1-3) (25% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history in NSW; including convictions for violence.</p> <p>Victim of domestic violence as a child.</p> <p>Left school yr 10.</p> <p>Employed construction industry.</p> <p>Long-term de facto relationship; two young children.</p> <p>Significant substance abuse</p>	<p>Ct 1: Unlawfully did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Cts 2 & 3: GBH with intent.</p> <p>The victims, E (aged 18 yrs) and D (aged 19 yrs) and three other males travelled in a Mercedes to an address. Unbeknown to the men the house was occupied by James and his family.</p> <p>James was not home when one of the males from the Mercedes knocked on the door. James' partner answered and was asked 'Where's Mohammed?'. She said no-one by that name lived there. She then telephoned James and told him what had occurred and that the Mercedes was still at the house.</p> <p>About 15 minutes later, James, Jonathan and Phillip arrived at the house. James was in a state of 'absolute uncontrollable rage'. A verbal altercation occurred with the occupants of the Mercedes. As a result the car began to reverse to escape the situation.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u></p>	<p><u>James</u> Ct 1: 1 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 6 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 6 yrs 6 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 6 yrs 6 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p><u>Jonathan</u> Ct 2: 5 yrs 9 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 5 yrs 9 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 9 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p><u>Phillip</u> Ct 2: 6 yrs imp (conc). Ct 3: 6 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 6 yrs imp.</p>	<p>Allowed (James). Dismissed (Jonathan and Phillip).</p> <p>Appeal concerned TES and totality principle.</p> <p><u>James</u> Order that the sentences cts 2 and 3 be served conc be set aside and substituted with an order of partial conc. Ct 2: To commence 19.11.2015. Ct 3: To commence 19.11.2017.</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 6 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [69] ... his Honour's stated approach to sentencing an offender for</p>

		<p>issues; alcohol; cocaine and methyl.</p> <p><u>Jonathan</u> 24 yrs at time offending. 25 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG. (cts 2-3) (25% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history relating to cannabis use in NSW; no prior WA convictions.</p> <p>Victim of domestic violence as a child; deeply entrenched family commitment which impacted decision-making on night of offences.</p> <p>Partially completed yr 12.</p> <p>Employed crowd controller and labourer.</p> <p>Single.</p> <p>History of depression; binge drinker; uses cannabis.</p> <p><u>Phillip S</u> 25 yrs at time offending.</p>	<p>James returned to his vehicle and drove in front of the Mercedes, forcing it backwards and causing it to veer off the roadway. When the Mercedes came to rest, three of the occupants fled the scene. Nobody suffered any physical injury.</p> <p><u>Cts 2 and 3</u> Phillip then went to the front passenger side the Mercedes and forcibly removed E from the vehicle, placing him in a neck-hold and dragging him to the other side of the vehicle. Phillip pushed E to the ground and stood over him to prevent him from getting up or leaving.</p> <p>At the same time, Jonathan went to the driver's side of the Mercedes and smashed its window, before striking D multiple times. Jonathan attempted to drag D from his vehicle, so D got out and sat down, being told he was not free to go.</p> <p>Meanwhile, James obtained two large knives from inside his home and returned carrying one in each hand. James walked up to where E was sitting and began to repeatedly stab and slash him. He was struck at least five times, unable to leave or defend himself. Eventually he was able to run from the scene.</p> <p>James chased E for a short time, before returning to where D, who had tried to flee, was now being held and punched by Jonathan and Phillip. James stabbed D multiple times as he was being restrained. Eventually he was able to run from the scene.</p>	<p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge took into account they acted in company with each other and each was involved in the offending "in a very severe way".</p> <p>The sentencing judge found James used the knife to deliberately inflict serious wounds to both victims and in doing so there was potential for serious or fatal injury.</p> <p><u>James</u> No remorse or victim empathy; willing to undergo counselling; moderate risk of reoffending.</p> <p><u>Jonathan</u> Ashamed of his offending behaviour; accepted responsibility; low risk of reoffending.</p> <p><u>Phillip</u> Remorseful; expressed regret about his behaviour.</p>	<p>multiple offences is in accordance with authority...his Honour, ... correctly, refers to the one transaction rule as potentially applying to the question of concurrency or cumulacy.</p> <p><u>James</u> At [84] Both victims suffered serious physical injuries. ... Both victims have been badly psychologically traumatised. Whilst the harm inflicted upon [E] and [D] is not as grave as in other cases, it is nevertheless of a high order.</p> <p>At [85] James' overall offending evinced a very high level of criminality. ... James was the principal offender. He substantially escalated the level of violence by going to his house, arming himself with two knives, and then stabbing and slashing ... [E] and then [D].</p> <p>At [86] ... He ferociously</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>26 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG. (cts 2-3) (20% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history in NSW; substantial traffic convictions in WA; at time of offending had recently been released to parole.</p> <p>Completed yr 12; won music scholarship; unable to take it up because of lack of funds.</p> <p>Employed as a courier and in packing.</p> <p>Currently single; father to 4 yr old son living in NSW.</p> <p>Heavy drinker and user of amphetamine.</p>	<p>Both victims were conveyed to RPH. E sustained multiple deep lacerations requiring surgery. He suffered serious damage to the ligaments in one arm, leaving him with impaired use of his hand. D sustained multiple stab wounds, the most serious of which punctured both lungs, causing them to collapse.</p>	<p>and mercilessly inflicted multiple wounds upon each of his victims. ... they could easily have had fatal consequences.</p> <p>At [88] ... He inflicted serious physical and psychological harm on two victims, in separate and distinct attacks. ...</p> <p>At [89] ... Neither victim did anything which justified the use of violence, let alone the extreme violence perpetrated by the respondent.</p> <p>At [99] ... the TES ... did not bear a proper relationship to the overall criminality involved in all of the offences he committed. The only reasonable view, in all the circ was that some accumulation of the individually appropriate sentences was necessary to properly reflect James' overall criminality.</p> <p><u>Jonathan</u></p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>At [106] There can be no doubt that Jonathan's conduct was serious. [He] willingly associated himself in a concerted attack on both victims. ...</p> <p>At [107] ... with respect to the offence committed on [E], Jonathan played a lesser role than James and Phillip. His presence assisted to prevent [E] from escaping. That is a significant feature relevant to the application of the totality principle.</p> <p>At [108] As serious as Jonathan's offending was, he did not wield the knife and had no physical contact with [E].</p> <p>At [111] ... we have not been persuaded that the TES imposed on Jonathan ... infringed the first limb of the totality principle. ... it was not unreasonable or plainly unjust to order conc on cts 2 and 3.</p> <p><u>Phillip</u> At [114] Phillip's</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>offending was also, without question serious.</p> <p>At [117] ... we have not been persuaded that the TES ... infringed the first limb of the totality principle. As was the case with Jonathon, it was open to the sentencing judge to take the view that concurrent sentences would bear a proper relationship to the overall criminality involved in all of Phillip's offences, viewed in their entirety, It was not unreasonable or plainly unjust to order concurrency on cts 2 and 3.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Transitional provisions repealed (14/01/2009)

Provisions were held to apply to the offence of s 304(2) despite the offence coming into operation after the enactment of the provisions (21/05/2004) in *Yates v The State of Western Australia* [2008] WASCA 144 overruling the majority decision in *The State of Western Australia v Wallam* [2008] WASCA 117 on that point.

s 304(2) Acts/omissions with intent (max penalty 20 yrs imp)

No.	Case	Antecedents	Summary/Facts	Sentence	Appeal
19.	<i>The State of Western Australia v Popal</i> [2020] WASCA 200	34 yrs at time offending. 37 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after PG (15% discount).	Ct 1: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Criminal damage. Ct 3: Act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 4: Criminal damage.	Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Cts 2; 4; 9-10: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 1 yr 3 mths imp (cum). Cts 5-7: 2 yrs imp (conc).	Allowed (length of sentences cts 1 & 8 and totality principle). Appeal concerned lengths of individual sentences cts 1, 3,

<p>Delivered 26/11/2020</p>	<p>No prior criminal history; conviction for reckless driving.</p> <p>Born Afghanistan; lived Australia 17 yrs.</p> <p>Wife; two children; another child with long-term partner.</p> <p>Very supportive family.</p> <p>Good work history; hard worker; earned very good money.</p> <p>Commenced using cannabis in high school; regular user of methyl 2 yrs prior to offending; using methyl with increasing frequency.</p> <p>History of drug-induced psychosis; in a drug-induced psychosis at time offending.</p>	<p>Ct 5: Act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 6: Act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 7: Criminal damage. Ct 8: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 9: Criminal damage. Ct 10: Armed likely to cause fear. Ct 11: Reckless driving.</p> <p>The respondent was driving his motor vehicle. He was in possession of a semi-automatic 9 mm handgun, registered in his name, and numerous rounds of ammunition.</p> <p>The victim, AH, was driving his vehicle on the same road and approached the respondent's vehicle from behind. The respondent pointed the handgun through his side window and backwards towards AH's vehicle. He then discharged three rounds into the sky and a further two rounds through his vehicle's sunroof.</p> <p>A short time later the respondent encountered another motorist., the victim GF. Overtaking GF's vehicle he pulled half off the road and stopped, causing GF to slow down to pass. As she did so, he pointed the gun out of his window and discharged it seven times into GF's vehicle. GF had to duck to avoid being struck by the shots fired.</p> <p>A short time later the respondent approached a</p>	<p>Ct 8: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 11: 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>MDL disq 2 yrs; firearms licence disq 10 yrs.</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 3 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending 'very serious'; there was the very considerable risk the respondent's conduct may have killed or very seriously physically injured the victims or an innocent passerby.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found but for the respondent's drug-induced psychosis he would not have offended, but that this condition was not mitigatory because it was self-inflicted.</p> <p>Psychological effect upon victims profound and enduring.</p> <p>Remorseful; rehabilitation programs undertaken while</p>	<p>5, 6, 8, 10 & 11; error in finding respondent of prior good character (cts 1- 10) and totality principle.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (conc). Cts 2; 4 & 9: 12 mths imp (conc). Cts 3; 5-6: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 7: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 8: 6 yrs imp (cum). Ct 10: 18 mths imp (cum). Ct 11: 12 mths imp (cum)</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [70] ... As the sentencing judge and defence counsel recognised, there was a very considerable risk that the respondent's offending conduct may have killed or very seriously physically injured the victims. ... To deliberately create such a risk involves a very high level of criminality.</p> <p>At [71] ... The respondent's actions were sudden and random against victims who</p>
---------------------------------	--	---	--	---

			<p>vehicle being driven by the victim, DS. He fired a shot at the vehicle. DS continued to his destination before inspecting his vehicle and noticing a bullet hole.</p> <p>A few minutes later the victims JM and LM (a father and his 16 yr old daughter) were travelling in a vehicle on the same road. The respondent discharged two rounds from the firearm, penetrating the tailgate of the vehicle.</p> <p>A short time later the respondent fired at least two shots at the victim's CB's vehicle. CB stopped on the side of the road to take photographs and as she leaned over to pick up her camera, she felt one of the bullets fly past her. The shot went through the vehicle's windscreen and into the driver's seat. Another hit the bonnet and ricocheted into the windscreen.</p> <p>The next day the respondent left his home address in his vehicle. He drove at speed and two unmarked police vehicles activated their emergency lights and sirens. He did not stop his vehicle and accelerated in an att to evade the police. He travelled in excess of 140 km p/h in a 70 km p/h zone, through a set of red traffic lights and without slowing down.</p> <p>The respondent's vehicle was eventually stopped. He was found to be in possession of a handgun and 192 rounds of ammunition.</p> <p>A search of the two residences used by the</p>	<p>on remand, including drug and alcohol counselling.</p> <p>Minimal risk of reoffending if continues to not use illicit drugs.</p>	<p>were completely unprepared for what occurred, and therefore extremely vulnerable. The respondent was in a psychotic state as a result of his voluntary use of methyl. ... the fact that he was in this self-induced state provides no mitigation whatever. The respondent's conduct was both outrageous and extremely dangerous. Conduct of the kind in which the respondent engaged, ... must be generally deterred and, ordinarily at least, must be met with substantial punishment.</p> <p>At [75] ... the sentences imposed ... on both cts 1 and 8 were manifestly inadequate. The sentences were not merely low or lenient. Each was unreasonable or plainly unjust having regard to the max penalty of 20 yrs' imp, the objectively serious criminality of the offences, the particular need to provide proper punishment and general deterrence, and the mitigation. ...</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>respondent also located a further 256 rounds of ammunition.</p> <p>After his arrest the respondent was admitted to Graylands Hospital for treatment for his drug-induced psychosis.</p>		
<p>18.</p>	<p><i>Hayward v The State of Western Australia</i></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 & 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 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>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>Demonstrated lack of remorse; very significant risk of reoffending in a violent way.</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 unsophisticated or committed on the spur of the moment, it was clearly a</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 he could borrow some money. This request was refused so he demanded \$200 saying he had a fully-loaded pistol. Two staff members told</p>		<p>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 sentencing discretion. ... The sentence ... was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>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>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>
17.	<p><i>Forrest v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 172</p> <p>Delivered 05/11/2019</p>	<p>35 yrs at time offending. 36 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; prior convictions for assault.</p> <p>Dysfunctional childhood; subjected to violence and abuse.</p> <p>Completed yr 11.</p> <p>Six children from previous relationships.</p>	<p>Ct 1: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Unlawfully did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>Forrest and the victims, Lenon and Campbell, were sentenced prisoners.</p> <p>Forrest knew Lenon by reputation and was disgusted by the crime which she had committed.</p> <p>Lenon was standing in a queue, alongside Campbell, when Forrest decided to pour a cup of tea over her. She obtained a container and filled it with hot water.</p> <p>Forrest returned to the queue and, from behind</p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 5 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the assault upon Ms Lenon was a 'vigilante' attack; which aggravated the seriousness of the offending.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending agg by premeditation and because she was in custody in</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence.</p> <p>At [48] The appellant's offending was very serious. The offending was unprovoked and motivated by vigilantism. It involved some premeditation. ... The assault occurred in a custodial setting where prisoners are vulnerable to attack by other prisoners. Ms Lenon suffered significant injuries ... The appellant' offending had the potential</p>

		<p>History of substance abuse; commenced using cannabis aged 12 yrs; amphetamine and alcohol use.</p> <p>Suffers various physical and mental illnesses.</p>	<p>and without warning, poured the hot water onto Lenon. Some of the hot water splashed onto Campbell.</p> <p>Lenon suffered deep dermal second degree burns to 21% of her body. She required specialist care and spent two days in intensive care. Her burns healed without the need for surgery, but she was left with some degree of scarring.</p> <p>Campbell suffered minor burns.</p>	<p>respect of other violent offending.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the potential for harm was far greater than the harm that actually occurred</p> <p>Cooperative; some belated indications of remorse and acceptance of responsibility for her offending.</p>	<p>to cause Ms Lenon a life-threatening injury.</p> <p>At [54] ... The sentence was commensurate with the seriousness of the offence after taking into account the maximum penalty of 20 yrs' imp, ... The sentence was reasonably open to his Honour on a proper exercise of his discretion. The sentence was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p><i>Vander Waide v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 148</p> <p>Delivered 26/09/2019</p>	<p>35 yrs at time offending. 36 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial (cts 1-5). Convicted late PG (ct 6) (10% discount).</p> <p>Long criminal history; appalling traffic record.</p> <p>Parents separated; raised by his mother.</p> <p>Supportive mother.</p> <p>Victimised and experienced trauma during childhood.</p> <p>History of substance abuse</p>	<p>Ct 1: Steal motor vehicle. Ct 2: Wilful and unlawful damage. Ct 3: Unlawfully did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 4: Fail to render assistance to victim of incident occasioning BH. Ct 5: Fail to report a road traffic accident. Ct 6: Assault public officer with intent to resist arrest.</p> <p>Vander Waide hired a four-wheel drive vehicle. He had no intention of ever returning it. He treated the vehicle as his own, replacing the registration plates and pulling out the back seat so as to use it as a mobile home.</p> <p>Some weeks later Vander Waide, in the company of a female and her 16-yr-old daughter, drove the vehicle to a hotel. At the hotel he became angry with his female</p>	<p>Ct 1: 9 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 15 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 7 yrs imp (cum). Ct 4: 18 mths imp (conc). MDL disqu 3 yrs (conc). Ct 5: 12 mths imp (conc). MDL disqu 2 yrs (conc). Ct 6: 3 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 9 yrs 3 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant 'a dangerous man'; he drove the vehicle 'angrily and violently' at a speed of slightly more than 70 km p/h into the victim, who was extremely</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence (ct 3); totality principle and miscarriage of justice (failure to take into account sexual assault in custody and additional evidence supporting mental impairment)</p> <p>At [57] ... while the additional evidence shows that, contrary to his Honour's findings, the appellant was, in fact, suffering from a mental illness, that mental illness is not materially mitigatory and does not materially</p>

		<p>from an early age; including alcohol, cannabis, prescription medications and methyl.</p>	<p>companions. In an agitated and aggressive state he returned to the vehicle and drove off, accelerating very quickly down the road.</p> <p>The victim, Mr Baker, was one of a group of motorcycle enthusiasts who had been at the hotel. He and Vander Waide did not know each other.</p> <p>Soon after leaving the hotel Vander Waide encountered Mr Baker and his group. He approached them at speed from the rear. One member, Mr Joss, stopped on the side of the road to let him pass. He deliberately drove at Mr Joss's motorcycle, striking it and causing \$2,319.20 worth of damage. Mr Joss was forced to jump out of the way to avoid being hit.</p> <p>Vander Waide then accelerated, driving faster than the posted speed limit, to catch up with Mr Baker. Travelling at over 70 km p/h, and without braking, he drove into the back of Mr Baker's motorcycle. Mr Baker suffered multiple serious injuries, including fractures to his neck, which could have led to paralysis.</p> <p>Vander Waide drove away from the scene. He did not stop to render assistance or report the incident to police.</p> <p>Several days later police officers saw Vander Waide riding a bicycle. They confronted him. An officer, who was wearing a vest which clearly identified her as a police officer, yelled</p>	<p>vulnerable riding a motorcycle; his actions were premediated and deliberate and he used his vehicle 'as a weapon'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant was not suffering from a mental impairment which caused his offending and the alleged sexual assaults in custody, 'cannot impact to any extent' upon the sentence he was obliged to impose.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the alleged sexual assaults, 'cannot impact to any extent' upon the sentence he was obliged to impose.</p> <p>No demonstrated remorse; high risk of reoffending; poorly motivated towards drug abstinence.</p>	<p>change the seriousness of the appellant's offending or his high risk of further reoffending. ... The additional evidence, had it been before the sentencing judge, should not have led to a different sentence. ...</p> <p>At [74] The appellant's offending in respect of ct 3 was undeniably very serious, ... The appellant deliberately drove his substantial four-wheel drive vehicle at about 70 km per hr, so that he effectively rammed the vehicle into the motorcycle being ridden by Mr Baker. Given that Mr Baker was riding a motorcycle, he was vulnerable to personal injury in such a collision, as the appellant must have appreciated. The appellant's actions were premediated and were completely unjustified. The appellant acted out of anger and used his vehicle as a weapon.</p> <p>At [75] The risk to the victim's life, health and safety was obvious. Mr</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

			at him to stop and pull over. He rode off. He was intercepted and, in a further attempt to escape arrest, struck the officer in the arm with a motorcycle helmet. She sustained minor injuries.		<p>Baker was lucky to survive. The consequences of the appellant's offending ... are a serious aggravating factor.</p> <p>At [82] ... The other offences committed by the appellant were, in themselves, serious. The theft of the Toyota Prado (ct 1) was planned ... The appellant sought to disguise his actions by changing the registration plates. ...</p> <p>At [83] ... the seriousness of cts 2, 4, 5 and 6 must not be overlooked. The appellant deliberately damaged Mr Joss's motorcycle. In doing so, he endangered Mr Joss's safety. After colliding with Mr Baker's motorcycle, [he] callously drove off</p> <p>At [84] Given the overall seriousness of the offending, that it occurred over several days and that different victims were affected, some cumulacy of the individual sentences imposed ... was required.</p>
15.	<i>Gleeson v The</i>	18 yrs at time offending.	1 x With intent to harm did an act likely to	7 yrs imp.	Dismissed.

<p><i>State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 100</p> <p>Delivered 20/07/2019</p>	<p>19 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Prior juvenile criminal history; including serious assaults.</p> <p>Subjected to neglect since early childhood; exposed to domestic violence; illicit drug use and parental separation.</p> <p>Dysfunctional education; suspended and expelled from schools.</p> <p>No real employment history.</p> <p>2 yr relationship; some supportive from his partner.</p> <p>Illicit drug use from a very young age; including cannabis; methyl; ecstasy and inhalants from aged 10.</p> <p>Medicated for ADHD.</p>	<p>endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>Gleeson and two associates went to a park with the intention of fighting a rival group. They were armed with a crowbar.</p> <p>During the fight one of Gleeson's associates was knocked unconscious. Gleeson ran from the scene, but on realising the associate was not with him, returned to help him. He then armed himself with the crowbar. At this stage the rival group had dispersed.</p> <p>A short time later Gleeson saw the rival group. Still armed with the crowbar he ran towards them, chasing after the victim, who was armed with a 'stick-like weapon'.</p> <p>Gleeson caught up with the victim and swung the crowbar. He struck the victim in the head with such force the crowbar lodged in his skull. Gleeson removed it and ran from the scene.</p> <p>The victim required emergency surgery to remove fragments of his skull from his brain. He suffered partial paralysis.</p>	<p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge characterised the offending 'in the mid and getting up to the upper range of offending' for offences of this kind and the victim's injuries were 'in the upper range of seriousness'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending agg by the appellant having been on a supervised release order at the time of the offending; it arose from an earlier 'gang attack' in a public place and it involved the use of a weapon.</p> <p>Sentenced on basis that in striking the victim with the crowbar, the appellant intended to unlawfully cause some unspecified bodily harm to the victim, but not the harm that the victim actually suffered.</p> <p>Appellant remorseful; awareness of the severity of his offending and implications for the victim;</p>	<p>Appeal concerned length of sentence.</p> <p>At [74] The actions of the appellant in chasing and striking the victim to the head with the metal crowbar were gratuitous acts of revenge. As the appellant said ... he 'hunted' the victim. The appellant was not responding to any perceived threat to himself or his associates. The victim was retreating from the appellant The victim had his back to the appellant. The sentencing judge found that 'the fight between the two gangs was really over and [the appellant] had become the aggressor'. ... The victim's conduct did not mitigate the appellant's offending.</p> <p>At [75] ... The unspecified bodily harm which the appellant intended to cause to the victim must be viewed in the context of the crowbar being a very heavy metal object. The appellant's action in striking the victim</p>
---	--	--	--	---

				medium risk of violent reoffending.	<p>with the crowbar involved a very high degree of endangerment to the victim. The likely outcome of a forceful blow to the victim's head with the crowbar was a very serious injury.</p> <p>At [76] The appellant's action in striking the victim to the head with the crowbar had the potential to cause catastrophic harm, if not death, to the victim. ... the victim in fact suffered devastating injuries and significant emotional trauma. ...</p> <p>At [81] The fact that the appellant inflicted one blow to the victim and not multiple blows was not mitigating. ... the single blow produced a shocking outcome. The crowbar lodged in the victim's skull. The appellant had to remove the crowbar from the victim's skull. ... then fled without endeavouring to provide or obtain any assistance for the victim.</p>
14.	<i>Quirk v The State of Western</i>	34 yrs at time offending. 36 yrs at time sentencing.	Cts 1 & 2: Assault public officer. Ct 3: With intent to harm did an act likely to	Ct 1: 1 yr 6 mths imp (cum).	Appeal dismissed.

<p><i>Australia</i></p> <p>[2019] WASCA 76</p> <p>Delivered 21/05/2019</p>	<p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Prior criminal history, including common assault and assaulting a public officer.</p> <p>Youngest of four children; parents separated when young child.</p> <p>Struggled at school; adequate literacy and numeracy skills; expelled yr 11.</p> <p>Stable employment mining industry; suffered workplace injury; received workers compensation payments; eventually made redundant.</p> <p>Stable 15 yr relationship; supportive.</p> <p>Personal stresses, including financial and deaths of family members shortly before offending.</p> <p>Past history of cannabis and alcohol abuse; commenced using methyl 12 mths prior</p>	<p>endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>Police attended Quirk's home to execute a SW and forced entry when he refused to open the door.</p> <p>As the officers entered they saw a small fire burning on the carpet and Quirk standing nearby, shouting abuse at them. He then pointed a fire extinguisher at the officers and sprayed it in their faces. He did not stop when repeatedly asked to do so.</p> <p>Concerned they had been sprayed with a flammable liquid one officer tried to deploy pepper spray, but the force of the spray from the fire extinguisher blew it back onto him.</p> <p>Quirk retreated into the room where the fire was burning and, as the police officers approached, threw an accelerant onto the fire. It immediately ignited engulfing the room in flames and smoke.</p> <p>Putting on a helmet Quirk charged at the officers. He was tasered and fell to the floor. After a considerable struggle he was restrained and taken out of the house.</p> <p>The two officers suffered smoke inhalation and sustained minor injuries. The home was largely destroyed by the fire.</p>	<p>Ct 2: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 3: 3 yrs imp (cum).</p> <p>4 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found while the police officers were not seriously injured, the potential consequences of the appellant's conduct involved a 'very real risk of serious injury'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge sentenced on basis the appellant's intention was not to cause harm to the police officers, but to hinder the execution of the SW.</p> <p>The sentencing judge accepted the appellant was affected by drugs at the time; whilst his conduct was not pre-meditated, it was deliberately aggressive and placed the lives of police officers at risk; his conduct in using a volatile substance on a fire in circumstances where police officers were in close</p>	<p>Appeal concerned totality principle; individual sentences not challenged.</p> <p>At [53] ... the appellant's offending as a whole was very serious. It involved the commission of three offences which, individually, were serious by their nature, and constituted serious instances of offending of that kind.</p> <p>At [56] ... While the appellant's intent was not to endanger the life, health or safety of the police officers, his act of throwing accelerant onto the fire, in a confined space, and where the officers were in close proximity, was extremely dangerous, and placed the lives, health or safety of those officers at risk. The fact that the officers sustained only minor physical injuries as a result of the appellant's conduct does not detract from the fact that the offending the subject of ct 3 was of a very serious nature.</p>
---	--	---	--	---

		to offending.		<p>proximity was most dangerous; it was ‘serious offending by any measure’ and this was a serious example of the offence under s 304(2).</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the use of the fire extinguisher as a weapon and the use of the accelerant in a confined space aggravated the seriousness of the offences.</p> <p>Remorseful; belated insight into his offending; counselling undertaken to address drug use and dealing with life stressors; low risk of re-offending in a violent manner; increased risk if recommences use of illicit substances.</p>	<p>At [58] ... the offending in respect of [cts 1 and 2] was also serious. In spraying the fire extinguisher onto the two police officers, the appellant clearly sought to impede them in their exercise of the SW. In the case of offences involving assaults on police officers, to resist or hinder police officers in the performance of their lawful duties, deterrence, including general deterrence, is an important sentencing consideration.</p> <p>At [60] ... The offending the subject of cts 1 and 2 clearly added to the criminality of the offending the subject of ct 3. ... a degree of accumulation between the sentences for ct 1 (or cts 1 and 2) on the one hand, and ct 3 on the other hand, was warranted to reflect the overall criminality of the appellant’s conduct.</p>
13.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v. Darroch</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA</p>	<p>44 yrs at time offending. 45 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p>	<p>Ct 1: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Assault public officer causing bodily harm.</p> <p>Darroch drove to a country store. He</p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 6 yrs imp. EFP.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal against length of sentence (ct 1).</p> <p>Re-sentenced:</p>

<p>114</p> <p>Delivered 13/07/2018</p>	<p>Prior history of violent offending; including two offences of assaulting a police officer causing bodily harm while armed with a tomahawk.</p> <p>Unremarkable childhood.</p> <p>Left school yr 10.</p> <p>Completed trade apprenticeship.</p> <p>Unwell as a result of heavy drug abuse; on disability support pension; unable to cope with full-time work.</p> <p>History of physical and mental health issues; exacerbated by illicit drug use; long term schizoaffective disorder; long history of non-compliance with medication.</p> <p>Entrenched illicit drug use.</p>	<p>repeatedly entered the store and towards the toilets at the rear of the premises. He did not ask the attendant for a key. He left the store and waited outside by his vehicle.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the victim, a long-haul truck driver, entered the store, obtained the key, and went to use the facilities.</p> <p>By this time Darroch had refuelled his car. As a result of taking his time to pay for the fuel the store attendant went outside and challenged him regarding payment. Darroch began to drive off, before stopping and challenging the attendant to a fight when he noticed him chasing his vehicle. He then returned to his car and drove off.</p> <p>A few minutes later Darroch returned and entered the store armed with a hammer. Walking straight into the toilets he struck the victim a number of times to the head with the hammer, inflicting serious life-threatening injuries. He immediately left the store and drove off.</p> <p>Darroch was later arrested. He was not interviewed due to his mental state and aggressive behaviour. When taken to an interview room he punched a police officer, knocking his glasses from his face. The officer suffered a cut to his eyebrow, which bled and caused bruising and swelling.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found ct 1 a very serious example of this type of offending and ‘clearly in the worst category for this type of offending’.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending aggravated by the vulnerability of the victim who was taken by surprise by an unprovoked and senseless attack; he used considerable violence and struck the victim multiple times to the head; resulting in the victim suffering brain injuries and requiring 24-hr a day care and supervision for the rest of his life.</p> <p>The sentencing judge described the victim’s injuries as being ‘in the upper range of seriousness for this type of offence’.</p> <p>Remorseful.</p> <p>High risk of future violence.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 10 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 10 yrs imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [34] ... the catastrophic and permanent injuries suffered by the victim were a seriously agg feature of the appellant’s offence.</p> <p>At [35] There were also mitigating factors, the most relevant of which were the plea of guilty at the first reasonable opportunity, the respondent’s remorse and his mental health issues.</p> <p>At [43] ... the sentence imposed on ct 1 inadequately reflects the very serious nature of the offending, including deterrence and community protection. The sentence was not commensurate with the seriousness of the offence.</p>	<p>12. <i>DKN v. The State</i> 19 yrs at time offending. Ct 8: With intent to harm did an act likely to Ct 8: 2 yrs imp. Dismissed.</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--

<p><i>of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA 87</p> <p>Delivered 30/05/2018</p>	<p>Convicted after early PG (25% discount).</p> <p>No prior criminal history.</p> <p>Middle child of three siblings; parents separated aged 7 yrs.</p> <p>Volatile home environment; history of physical fights with mother, father and sisters; living with grandparents at time sentencing</p> <p>Left school yr 11; some work experience; undergoing TAFE studies at time sentencing.</p> <p>Supportive relationship at time sentencing.</p> <p>Good physical health; athletic; played volleyball and basketball at State level.</p>	<p>endanger life, health or safety. Ct 10: Stealing. Ct 12: Criminal damage.</p> <p>Through a social network application DKN and his co-offender, Mr N, arranged to meet the victim, purportedly for sex.</p> <p>DKN, Mr N and two other alleged male co-offenders planned to meet the victim to beat him up.</p> <p><u>Ct 8</u> At the arranged meeting point DKN stood waiting, while the other three men hid in nearby bushes. As the victim approached and greeted him the three men emerged.</p> <p>One of the alleged co-offenders walked behind the victim and struck him to the back of the head. As the victim tried to run Mr N tripped him. The victim fell to the ground. Mr N and an alleged co-offender punched, kicked and stomped on his head, body and face. DKN punched him in the face.</p> <p><u>Ct 10</u> DKN took the victim's wallet and stole \$40. Also taken from the wallet was the victim's licence. Mr N recorded the assault on his mobile phone while reading the victim's name from his licence, demanding he never do this again.</p> <p>The victim's house and car keys were also</p>	<p>Ct 10: 9 mths imp (conc). Ct 12: 9 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 2 yrs imp.</p> <p>40% discount from TES of 3 yrs 4 mths that would otherwise have been imposed if not for undertaking to provide evidence.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending aggravated by the appellant being in company; it was a premeditated and was intended to terrorise the victim; he was involved in the physical violence and punched the victim; stole money from the victim; returned to take his phone and then left the without attempting to render any assistance.</p> <p>Co-operative (undertaking to give evidence); genuinely remorseful; undertaken some counselling to address anger management issues.</p> <p>Low risk of future violent</p>	<p>Appeal concerned length and type of sentence for ct 8 only.</p> <p>At [48] ... The following ... demonstrate the significance of his role and the serious criminality of his offending: (1) ... He joined in a plan to lure the victim on false pretences (2) ... allowed his photograph to be used as part of the means of luring the victim. (3) ... met the victim at the planned location while the other offenders hid. (4) When other offenders seriously assaulted the victim, ... did not protest or remove himself from the situation. ... he stood by and then joined in the assault ... (5) ... compounded the attacked on the victim by stealing his wallet and removing money from it. (6) ... after walking away from the scene, ... returned ... [and] took the victim's mobile phone</p> <p>At [49] Although the conduct referred to in (5) and (6) occurred after the</p>
--	---	---	--	---

			<p>taken, before the offenders ran off.</p> <p><u>Ct 12</u> DKN and Mr N returned a short time later and demanded the victim's mobile phone. When Mr N threatened to kill him, the victim handed it over. The phone was smashed and thrown down a drain.</p> <p>The victim was hospitalised and treated for bleeding to the brain, as well as bruising and abrasions.</p>	offending.	<p>commission of ct 8 ... it shed light on the appellant's culpability in committing ct 8 and weighs against any suggestion that his involvement was fleeting.</p> <p>At [50] ... the attack on the victim caused him very serious, likely life-endangering, injuries including bleeding to the brain.</p> <p>At [53] ... The combined serious features of the appellant's offending demanded the imposition of a term of immediate imp ...</p> <p>At [54] ... we are not persuaded that the length of the sentence for ct 8 reveals implied error.</p>
11.	<p><i>Ugle v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2018] WASCA 16</p> <p>Delivered 16/02/2018</p>	<p>32 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (20% discount).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; including violence related offences.</p> <p>Supportive family; third eldest of seven siblings; up-</p>	<p>1 x With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>Ugle and her de facto partner (the co-offender) incorrectly believed the victim was responsible for the death of Ugle's sister.</p> <p>The victim was unknown to Ugle.</p> <p>Ugle approached the victim and asked him about his involvement in her sister's death.</p>	<p>4 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending aggravated by the use of a weapon and by the fact that even after the victim was unconscious on the ground she continued the assault by stomping on</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence.</p> <p>At [24] The appellant's offence was a serious example of an offence against s 304(2).</p> <p>At [25] ... the sentencing</p>

		<p>bringing disrupted by domestic violence; family feuding; family crises and a transient lifestyle.</p> <p>12 yr de facto relationship with co-offender.</p> <p>Unemployed.</p> <p>Three children; under care of Child Protection and Family Services.</p> <p>Difficulties with alcohol dependency.</p>	<p>When the victim ran away she gave chase. To protect himself the victim took an item from a bin and attempted to strike her with it.</p> <p>The victim walked away, only for Ugle to continue to follow him. After a scuffle the victim again att to walk away.</p> <p>A bystander tried unsuccessfully to intervene and separate Ugle from the victim.</p> <p>Ugle armed herself with a hammer which she used to strike the victim a number of times. The scuffle continued during which the victim tried to unsuccessfully grab the hammer. Ugle was able to strike the victim again, causing him to lose consciousness and collapse.</p> <p>While on the ground Ugle stomped on his head and neck twice.</p> <p>The co-offender became involved and kicked the victim in the chest. Ugle then kicked the victim three times to the chest.</p>	<p>his head and kicking him.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending conduct was persistent; the appellant continued to pursue and assault the victim, even though the victim retreated on a number of occasions and even though someone intervened.</p> <p>Genuinely remorseful; victim empathy.</p>	<p>judge's observation that the problem lay in the appellant's behaviour when she was under the influence of alcohol, not when she was sober, was, as her record of offending reveals, well placed.</p> <p>At [29] ... it is not reasonably arguable that the length of the term of imp was unreasonable or plainly unjust. The sentence of ... imp was commensurate with the seriousness of the offending and was within the range open to the sentencing judge ...</p>
10.	<p><i>McAllister v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2017] WASCA 183</p> <p>Delivered 12/10/2017</p>	<p>47 at time offending. 49 at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG (5% discount) (ct 1). Convicted after trial (ct 2).</p> <p>Prior criminal history; traffic and alcohol related offences.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Dep lib. Ct 2: With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>McAllister owned his own business and the victim was a former employee.</p> <p>When McAllister's business was burgled and items stolen he believed the victim to be the offender.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 15 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 3 yrs 9mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 5 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the offending involved a degree of premeditation over a</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence; parity and totality principles.</p> <p>At [44] ... it is not reasonably arguable that the sentence of 15 mths' immediate imp for ct 1 was manifestly excessive. That</p>

		<p>Born UK; moved to Australia aged 9 yrs; abused and traumatised as a child during time at Fairbridge Farm.</p> <p>Self-employed removalist; good character references; business collapsed after his detention in custody for these offences.</p> <p>Two adult children previous marriage.</p> <p>Medicated for depression; otherwise in good physical health.</p> <p>No history of illicit substances abuse.</p>	<p>With a promise of work McAllister contacted the victim and arranged to meet him at his business premises. The victim attended at the scheduled time. McAllister and two of his associates, Annakin and Bowden, the co-offenders, arrived soon after.</p> <p>McAllister was armed with a baseball bat and the two co-offenders with wooden sticks. They proceeded to assault and verbally abused the victim for a period of about 30 minutes.</p> <p>During the assault the victim denied any involvement in the burglary. McAllister called the victim a liar and threatened to smash his knee caps if he went to the police.</p> <p>The victim's hands were tied behind his back. He again denied any knowledge of the burglary or location of the stolen property so McAllister struck him on the knee with the bat, while laughing and joking with the co-offenders.</p> <p>At some point a substance, believed to be petrol, was sprayed on the victim's face, mouth and clothes and he was threatened with being set on fire.</p> <p>The victim eventually claimed to know where the stolen property was located and offered to show them. He then managed to escape and call police.</p> <p>The victim suffered a broken eye socket which</p>	<p>sustained period; there were three armed offenders against an unarmed victim; who for part of the assault, had his hands tied behind his back; it was completely unprovoked.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant believed the victim had committed the burglary and this factor required him to place significant emphasis on general deterrence to remind the community that vigilante behaviour will not be tolerated.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant significantly more culpable than his co-offenders having regard to the element of vigilantism in his conduct</p> <p>No significant remorse shown.</p>	<p>is, when the sentence is viewed from the perspective of the maximum penalty (10 years' imp), and after taking into account all relevant facts and circumstances and all relevant sentencing factors ...</p> <p>At [50] ... it is not reasonably arguable that the sentence of 3 years 9 months' immediate imp for ct 2 was manifestly excessive. That is, when the sentence is viewed from the perspective of the maximum penalty (20 years' imp), and after taking into account all relevant facts and circumstances and all relevant sentencing factors,</p> <p>At [56] ... the trial judge found, and was entitled to find, that the appellant was the instigator of the offending. The appellant lured the victim to the appellant's business premises with a promise of work, the appellant arranged for Mr Annakin and Mr Bowen to be present and there was an element of vigilantism in his</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			required surgery. He has ongoing problems with his jaw locking and his face droops on the left side.		conduct. ... the appellant entered a very late PG on ct 1 and went to trial on ct 2 whereas Mr Annakin and Mr Bowen entered early PG on both cts. At [61] The appellant's overall offending was serious. It was necessary for the trial judge to order that the individual sentence for ct 1 be served cum upon the individual sentence for ct 2 in order properly to mark the serious character of the offending on cts 1 and 2 as a whole.
9.	<i>Chikonga v The State of Western Australia</i> [2017] WASCA 34 Delivered 23/2/2017	28 yrs at time offending. 29 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after PG (10% discount). Lengthy criminal history; including substantial record of violent offences. Refugee from Rwanda; arrived in Australia aged eight yrs. Exposed to extreme violence as a child; witnessed att murder of his	1 x With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Chikonga and the victims were in a dispute over a motor vehicle and money owed. Driving to the victims home Chikonga deliberately accelerated the car towards the house and into the victims' bedroom. Chikonga's intention was to cause the victims a pecuniary detriment. The victims saw the car on CCTV and ran out of the bedroom. Chikonga went through the victim's home and damaged doors and upturned property in the house.	4yrs 6ths imp. EFP. The sentencing judge found the offending was in the upper range of seriousness; the appellant had an unreasonable belief that no-one home and his actions in targeting the bedroom were deliberate and motivated by a sense of grievance; he used a motor vehicle as a weapon with the intention of causing significant damage to entail significant	Dismissed. Appellant challenged length of sentence. At [32] While the appellant did not intend to cause physical harm, his deliberate conduct ... created a real risk of death or serious injury. It created considerable fear for the victims, one of whom has suffered significant psychological impact. ... the risk to health and safety of people may, in some cases,

		<p>mother by his father.</p> <p>Left school yr eight; completed two yrs bricklaying apprenticeship at time sentencing.</p>		<p>financial detriment.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant's conduct as highly dangerous; there was a significant risk that people would be in the home and there could have been death or serious injury to the occupants.</p>	<p>be as important as the actual harm caused. ... the appellant's record of violent offending meant that personal deterrence and the need to protect the community from further violent offending by the appellant were both significant considerations in the sentencing exercise.</p>
8.	<p><i>Kaokula v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 198</p> <p>Delivered 28/11/2016</p>	<p><u>Kaspar Kaokula</u> 24 yrs at time offending. 26 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p><u>Kuldar Kaokula</u> 31 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Both convicted after trial.</p> <p>Both had no prior criminal history.</p> <p>Brothers born in Estonia.</p> <p>Unremarkable upbringings; both single without dependants.</p> <p>On a working holiday in Australia. Difficulties with the English language.</p>	<p>1 x With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>The complainant worked as a supervisor on a fruit farm. Kaspar felt his girlfriend, who had been employed as a fruit picker, was treated badly by the complainant. The appellants planned revenge.</p> <p>The complainant was driving with his 3 yr-old daughter in the rear of this car when he was stopped by the appellants.</p> <p>Kaspar poured about 2 litres of petrol onto the windscreen, bonnet and roof of the complainant's car. Some of the petrol went into the interior of the car and onto the complainant through his partially open window.</p> <p>Kuldar held a cigarette lighter and lit the car, but the flame was blown out by the wind. The complainant accelerated away. As he did so he saw a spark from a cigarette lighter that Kaspar</p>	<p><u>Kaspar Kaokula</u> 6 yrs 2 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p><u>Kuldar Kaokula</u> 5 yrs 8 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending was carefully planned and agreed between the appellants well in advance and that the complainant was in a vulnerable position, trapped on a lonely road and encumbered by the fact that his daughter was strapped in the back of the car.</p> <p>Neither demonstrated remorse or acceptance of responsibility.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appellants challenged length of sentence.</p> <p>At [65] The risk to the life, health and safety of both the complainant and his daughter was very high. ... The fulfilment of the appellants' plan to ignite the petrol would probably have seriously burnt the complainant and his daughter, and created a real and substantial chance that they would be killed. While the appellants may not have been aware of the presence of the complainant's daughter ... they did not bother to check if anyone was with him. The fact that the petrol did not ignite was</p>

			<p>was holding.</p> <p>The complainant was pursued by the appellants' vehicle. He sought refuge at the farm.</p>	<p>The offending had very significant negative psychological consequences on the complainant and his family.</p>	<p>not for any want of trying on the appellants' part.</p>
7.	<p><i>Sophiadakis v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 203</p> <p>Delivered 25/11/2016</p>	<p>28 yrs at time offending. 29 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (25% discount).</p> <p>The appellant was on a pre-sentence order for the two agg AOBH offences at time offending on indictment.</p> <p>Significant prior criminal history; including convictions of unlawful damage, use of prohibited drugs, wounding, AOBH, assault a driver, common assault and breach of bail.</p> <p>Deprived childhood; exposed to violence.</p> <p>Illicit drug addiction at time offending; drug free at time sentencing.</p> <p>Drug-fuelled violence not out of character.</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u> 1 x With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u> Ch 1: Agg AOBH. Ch 2: Agg AOBH. Ch 3: Criminal damage. Ch 4: Breach of bail.</p> <p><u>Ch 1 & 2</u> A verbal altercation occurred between the Sophiadakis and the victim A.</p> <p>After Sophiadakis' children threw sand and grass on A's car, the victim's partner (B) confronted Sophiadakis and flicked the grass at her. Sophiadakis then attacked B, repeatedly punching him to the head (ch 1).</p> <p>A attempted to stop the fight. Sophiadakis grabbed A by the hair and punched her left eye. A fell to the ground and Sophiadakis repeatedly punched her to the head as she lay on the ground (ch 2).</p> <p><u>Indictment and ch 3</u> The victim C lived with Sophiadakis. Sophiadakis verbally abused C about a missing</p>	<p><u>Indictment</u> 4 yrs imp.</p> <p><u>Section 32 Notice</u> Ch 1: 15 mths imp (conc). Ch 2: 15 mths imp (cum). Ch 3: 18 mths imp (conc). Ch 4: 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 3 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge observed that the sentences for the two agg AOBH offences were shorter than the offences deserved because of totality reasons.</p> <p>The sentencing judge accepted for sentencing purposes that C was the appellant's drug supplier.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the flicking of grass by B was pretty minor, but probably inflamed the</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned the facts for Agg AOBH charges and totality.</p> <p>At [27] ... neither the prosecutor nor defence counsel who appeared in the District Court was aware of the negotiations and agreement on the material facts which occurred before the appellant entered her PG in the Magistrates Court ...</p> <p>At [28] ... the facts as stated in the Magistrates Court asserted that Rodney Smith had flicked grass into the appellant's face and that Rodney Smith had raised his fist towards the appellant before she struck him. By contrast, the facts as stated in the District Court ... asserted that Rodney Smith had flicked grass at the appellant and the stated facts</p>

		<p>Mental health issues; stabilised since in custody and ceased taking illicit drugs.</p> <p>Asserted at sentencing that she was upset with C because C had shown her daughter pornography and believed that C was grooming her daughter.</p>	<p>television. When C tried to placate him, he became aggressive and irrational. C bent over to pick up food he had thrown on the floor and Sophiadakis raised a hammer and said “I’m going to fucking kill you”. He then struck C repeatedly to the head. C raised her hands to protect herself and Sophiadakis hit her arms and legs. C suffered bruising to her arms and legs and required 14 staples to her head.</p> <p>Sophiadakis pursued C out of the house and struck the windscreen and door panel of the C’s car (ch 3). \$500 damage was caused to the car.</p> <p>Sophiadakis’ young children witnessed part of the offending.</p> <p><u>Ch 4</u> Sophiadakis failed to appear at the Magistrates Court for the return date of her pre-sentence order.</p>	<p>situation; the appellant was in a highly volatile state anyway and may well have overreacted even if B had treated her with kid gloves.</p> <p>The appellant's mental health was of limited mitigatory value. The sentencing judge found that illicit drug use was the predominant problem, but accepted that there was also an underlying mental fragility which was exacerbated by the use of drugs. The appellant abused illicit drugs knowing that she had a tendency to behave violently when both under the influence of and when coming down from drugs.</p> <p>High risk of violent reoffending if relapses into substance abuse and has further contact with C.</p> <p>No evidence of remorse above PG.</p>	<p>did not include the assertion that Rodney Smith had raised his fist towards the appellant before she struck him.</p> <p>At [33] ... the appellant's response was grossly disproportionate on either version of the facts... even if the appellant should have been sentenced on the basis of the facts as alleged in the Magistrates Court, no different individual sentences should have been imposed for the offences of agg AOBH and no different TES should have been imposed.</p> <p>At [34] ... the level of violence inflicted by the appellant on Samantha Smith, as alleged in the Magistrates Court, was less than the level of violence, as alleged in the District Court, is significant, to the extent it was alleged in the District Court that the appellant struck Samantha Smith to the head after she had fallen to the ground, but less significant, to the extent it</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

					was alleged in the District Court that the appellant grabbed Samantha Smith by the hair. However...even if the appellant should have been sentenced on the basis of the facts as alleged in the Magistrates Court, no different individual sentences should have been imposed for ... agg AOBH and no different TES should have been imposed.
6.	<p><i>Penny v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2016] WASCA 52</p> <p>Delivered 23/03/2016</p>	<p>45 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Lengthy criminal history, including murder, threat to kill, GBH, sex pen without consent, dep lib, and dishonesty and drug offences.</p> <p>Limited education.</p> <p>Antisocial personality disorder.</p> <p>High risk of reoffending.</p>	<p>1 x s 304(2)(b) - With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>Penny, driving a bus, was stopped by police. When asked if he had anything to declare, including firearms, he responded 'No'.</p> <p>Penny exited the bus through the rear door with a sawn-off 410 shotgun concealed under his clothes and attempted to dispose of the gun.</p> <p>On suspicion he was concealing something Sgt Williams told Penny he was to be searched and repeatedly requested Penny to show his hands. Penny refused and resisted violently causing Sgt Williams to fire his taser twice.</p> <p>Penny pulled the shotgun out of his shorts. Const Needs drew her firearm and shouted for him to drop the gun. Sgt Williams tackled Penny and there was a violent struggle for control of the gun. He was repeatedly told to</p>	<p>9 yrs imp.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that Penny intended to use the gun to escape from police, but was not satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that Penny intentionally discharged the shotgun.</p> <p>Significant adverse impact on both police officers and the fact that they were performing an important public function.</p> <p>No remorse, victim empathy or insight as to the causes of his offending behaviour.</p>	<p>Allowed – by majority on the basis that the sentencing judge erred in finding that the appellant intended to endanger the life, health and safety of Sgt Williams [30]-[31], [74]-[75].</p> <p>Penny challenged length of sentence.</p> <p>Re-sentenced 6 yrs imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [42] ... In assessing the seriousness of the offence, regard can be had to the potential, as distinct from the actual, consequences to a person's life, health or safety of the offender's conduct.... Based on the results of</p>

			<p>drop the gun, which was at times pointed at Sgt Williams' face. Const Needs unsuccessfully tried to stop Penny and attempted to disarm him.</p> <p>Sgt Williams, fearing he would be shot, grabbed the gun and Penny's hand to get him to release his grip. The gun went off near Sgt Williams' face. Const. Needs shot Penny in the stomach with her firearm.</p>		<p>forensic testing, the objective risk of the gun accidentally discharging was significant.</p> <p>At [58] A particularly serious aspect of the offending is that the victim of the offence was a police officer acting in the execution of his duty. The use of a firearm against police officers performing their lawful duty significantly elevates the appellant's criminality.</p>
5.	<p><i>Lawrence v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2015] WASCA 187</p> <p>Delivered 14/09/2015</p>	<p>34 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Lengthy criminal history, including numerous convictions of violent offences.</p> <p>Offences committed six months after release from prison.</p> <p>Difficult and dysfunctional upbringing.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Act with intent to cause bodily harm. Ct 2: AOBH. Ct 3: Stealing.</p> <p>Lawrence and the co-offender, Winmar, were highly intoxicated.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u> Lawrence and Winmar were in an aggressive mood and approached the victim's group. A stare-down ensued between Winmar and the victim. Winmar took up a boxing stance and the victim tried to calm the situation down. A fistfight broke out and each landed blows on the other.</p> <p>Lawrence punched the victim in the back of the head from behind, causing a cut to his chin. The victim fell to the ground and lapsed in and</p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp. Ct 2: 1 yrs imp (cum). Ct 3: 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 6 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge characterised the offending as 'at the high end involving gratuitous violence in company against innocent members of the community'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that there was a real potential that harm might</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [34] ... his antecedents, offending behaviour, lack of insight and absence of remorse belie genuine rehabilitation.</p> <p>At [41] His criminal history is disturbing... the appellant represents a danger to the community...</p>

			<p>out of consciousness. Lawrence and Winmar kicked and stomped on the victim's upper body and head.</p> <p>The victim received 11 stitches to his chin and sustained a concussion, scalp haematomas, black eye, facial swelling and bruising and soreness to his upper body and neck area.</p> <p><u>Cts 2-3</u> Lawrence and Winmar then came across the second victim. The victim attempted to avoid them.</p> <p>Lawrence and Winmar corralled the victim. Lawrence punched the victim in the eye with substantial force, knocking him to the ground. Lawrence and Winmar punched and kicked him while on the ground.</p> <p>The victim got to his feet and ran away, leaving his mobile on the ground. Railway police later found the mobile in Lawrence's pocket.</p> <p>The victim sustained a black eye, facial bruising and swelling, grazing and abrasions to his knees and hands and extensive bruising to his inner left thigh.</p>	<p>have been caused to both victims by reason of the force used by the appellant and Winmar.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found appellant had no remorse, no insight into seriousness of his actions and no concern for victims.</p>	
4.	<p><i>De Alwis v The State of Western Australia [No 2]</i></p> <p>[2015] WASCA 42</p>	<p>65 yrs at time offending. 66 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Diagnosed with psychosis.</p>	<p>1 x s 304(2)(a) - Act with intent to cause bodily harm.</p> <p>The appellant and the victim were previously living together and married. Following separation, the victim obtained a violence</p>	<p>4 yrs 9 mths imp.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found the conduct was premeditated, violent and life-threatening.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [127] It is of no significance that the appellant's breaches were of interim orders rather than</p>

	Delivered 10/03/2015	Born in Sri Lanka; two children from an earlier marriage; obtained legal qualifications in Sri Lanka and Australia.	restraining order against the appellant. The victim was standing alone outside of her unit. The appellant ran towards the victim, holding a long-handled shovel and meat cleaver. The appellant struck the victim on the top of her head with the shovel, causing a significant laceration to her forehead, which cut through the skin and soft tissue to the bone. A pedestrian observed the incident, intervened and restrained the appellant until police arrived.	Sentencing judge found a total absence of remorse, lack of judgment and no insight into offending behaviour. Sentencing judge found that the appellant's mental condition was not causative of the offending, but was a contributing factor to an extent which was difficult to quantify.	final violence restraining orders. At [139] Save for the mitigation arising from the appellant's mental condition, there are no mitigating factors in this case. Of significant concern are the findings that the appellant was unremorseful, lacked judgment and had no insight into his offending, all of which underscore the need for protection of the public and for personal deterrence. Although the sentence is at the high end of the sound sentencing range, it is not manifestly excessive.
3.	<i>Beard v The State of Western Australia</i> [2015] WASCA 74 Delivered 09/04/2015	36 yrs at time sentencing. Convicted after late PG. Significant criminal history including speeding, drink driving, reckless driving and AOBH. Relatively normal childhood; completed yr 12. Unemployed at time offending; stressed.	Ct 1: s 304(2)(b) - With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety. Ct 2: Manslaughter. The appellant was driving his car heavily intoxicated by methyl. The first victim was driving behind the appellant and, after indicating, he pulled out, intending to pass the appellant's car. As he overtook the car, the appellant suddenly, and without any justification, rammed his car into the side of the victim's car. In an attempt to get his car on the road, the victim steered his car back into the appellant's car.	Ct 1: 3 yrs 1 mth imp. Ct 2: 12 yrs 4 mths imp (to commence 8 mths after ct 1). TES 13 yrs imp. EFP. Sentencing judge found limited victim empathy and prospects of rehabilitation mitigating. Criminal history showed	Dismissed. At [42] ... his Honour's characterisation, when read in context, was not a finding that ct 2 was in the worst category of manslaughter cases generally. At [43] It is clear from what his Honour said that he was agreeing with the prosecutor's submission... that ct 2 was 'in the worst category of motor vehicle

		<p>Two children from prior relationships.</p> <p>History of drug use.</p>	<p>The victim tried to get away from the appellant. The appellant pursued the victim at high speed, ramming his car into the victim's car another two times. This forced the victim's car sideways into the kerb and to spin onto the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>In a desperate attempt to escape the appellant, the victim sped past a number of cars so that he was in front when the lanes merged into one. With the intention of causing harm to the victim, the appellant drove at a dangerous speed onto the gravel verge. He took over the cars in front of him, causing other motorists to take evasive action.</p> <p>The appellant lost control when at least part of his car was still on the gravel verge. His car suddenly slewed, in a diagonal direction onto the wrong side of the road and into the path of a car being driven by the second victim. They collided head on. The appellant was driving fast enough to stop the second victim's car and push it backwards. The second victim had no opportunity to avoid the collision.</p> <p>The second victim died at the scene. The appellant was pinned in his vehicle with serious physical injuries.</p> <p>The appellant claimed to be the person being pursued.</p>	<p>disobedience to road traffic laws.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found aggravated by: highly reckless conduct; speed grossly inappropriate for position car was being driven; adversely affected by methyl; victim had no opportunity to take evasive action.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found both cts in the category of the more serious offending of its type; ct 2 in worst category of offending in such cases.</p> <p>Appellant presented with risk factors relating to substance abuse and ability to control emotions.</p>	<p>manslaughter cases'.</p> <p>At [44] Such a conclusion was, having regard to his Honour's findings as to the circumstances of the offending, completely justified.</p> <p>At [50] There is no tariff for manslaughter ...</p> <p>At [53] ...it must be born in mind that both Penny and Brown, and for that matter, Munda, were all decided before the increase in the maximum penalty for manslaughter. Those cases, and the authorities reviewed in them, must be reviewed in that light.</p> <p>At [57] Anyone who drives intoxicated by methyl and in that state commits the offence of manslaughter, must expect to receive a significant custodial penalty.</p> <p>At [61] Ct 1 carries a maximum penalty of 20 years' imp. On any account, the sentence imposed on that ct was lenient, particularly</p>
--	--	---	---	---	--

					having regard to the persistency of the appellant's attempts to harm (the first victim), the use of his motor vehicle as a weapon, and the terror the appellant inflicted upon (the second victim).
2.	<p><i>Hinkley v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2014] WASCA 122</p> <p>Delivered 16/06/2014</p>	<p>25 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG.</p> <p>Minor criminal record; traffic convictions.</p> <p>Left school at 15 yrs.</p> <p>Limited employment history; completed courses whilst on home detention.</p> <p>Close relationship with family.</p> <p>Long history of depression that had been poorly treated.</p> <p>History of marijuana and amphetamine-based substance abuse.</p> <p>Consumed drugs the day before the offence and was 'coming down' from them</p>	<p>1 x s 304(2)(b) - With intent to harm did an act likely to endanger life, health or safety.</p> <p>The victim was the mother of the appellant's ex partner's two children.</p> <p>Following the breakdown of their relationship, the appellant's ex-partner asked her to remove her belongings from the house they shared. The appellant made threatening comments towards his children and the victim. The ex-partner's children were at the house at the time. The ex-partner contacted the victim and asked her to collect the children. The appellant packed her belongings and left the house.</p> <p>The victim arrived at the house, parked her car and walked towards the house. As she did she noticed the appellant was sitting in the driver's seat of a vehicle parked near the front of the house. The ex-partner was speaking to the appellant through the window.</p> <p>As the victim walked up the driveway towards the house, the appellant deliberately drove at the victim, who managed to evade the vehicle. The appellant then reversed her vehicle and hit</p>	<p>30 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>Remorse.</p> <p>Intended as an act of revenge against her ex-partner for asking her to leave the house, rather than as a result of any particular grievance against the victim.</p> <p>Sentencing judge noted actions were deliberate and persistent; seriousness of the appellant's intent to harm was at the high end, and the potential, as distinct from the actual, consequences for her conduct placed the offending in the serious bracket for this type of offending.</p>	<p>Dismissed on papers.</p> <p>At [24] The offending in this case was very serious.</p>

		at time of offending.	<p>the victim's vehicle. The appellant reversed again, this time into the victim's motor vehicle, causing damage. The appellant then drove away.</p> <p>The victim and the appellant's ex-partner went to inspect the damage. The appellant returned and deliberately drove at speed at the victim, who was facing the other way and did not see the vehicle coming. The appellant hit the victim from behind, causing her to flip into the air over the bonnet of the appellant's car vehicle it continued forwards. The victim's shoulder struck the windscreen, causing it to smash. The victim then fell onto the grass verge. The appellant drove away without making any attempt to render assistance.</p> <p>The victim sustained bruising, grazing to her body and continuing back pain.</p>	Accepted offending was impulsive and opportunistic, and occurred while she was in a highly agitated state; found mental illness had affected her judgment.	
1.	<p><i>Blurton v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2014] WASCA 61</p> <p>Delivered 21/03/2014</p>	<p>26 yrs at time offending. 27 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG (PG Cts 1 & 2 in full satisfaction of indictment).</p> <p>Recent violent criminal history; including armed robbery, deprivation of liberty, common assault & unlawful damage.</p> <p>Father of five young children.</p>	<p>Ct 1: AOBH. Ct 2: Acts with intent to cause bodily harm. Ct 3: Unlawful wounding. Ct 4: Criminal damage.</p> <p>Blurton was at a family party. Late in the evening he had an argument with his partner and as a result, he left. Drunk and angry he walked onto the road and remained there, posing a hazard to himself.</p> <p>The two victims, both off-duty police officers, were passengers in a motor vehicle. Blurton stood in front of their vehicle on the roadway causing the driver to slow down and drive</p>	<p>Ct 1: 12 mths imp. Ct 2: 2 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>TES 3 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>Little victim empathy.</p> <p>Voluntarily handed himself into Police.</p> <p>Appellant and co-offender assisted police in the prosecution of third co-</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>At [38] ... As his Honour rightly said, the offences were unprompted and unprovoked by the victims. The appellant assaulted both men out of anger brought on by self-induced intoxication, a factor which affords no mitigation.</p>

		<p>Not of good character.</p> <p>Intoxicated and angry on the night of the offence.</p>	<p>around him. As she did and without reason, Blurton struck the vehicle several times with his fist. The driver stopped the car.</p> <p>One of the victims got out of the car and approached Blurton. Blurton swung a number of punches at him, which missed, but eventually the victim was struck to the left side of the jaw with a clenched fist. At this point, others who had been at the party, including two co-offenders, joined in the attack. The victim was knocked to the ground, kicked and punched by various people.</p> <p>The second victim got out of the car to assist. He made known to the victim that he was a police officer. Blurton approached the second victim and punched him in the face. Others also attacked him. The victim ended up on the ground, struggling with the co-offenders. As a result he sustained a laceration to his lip.</p> <p>The first victim then came to the second victim's aid and pushed his attacker's away. The two men retreated towards their vehicle. As the first victim was retreating, Blurton and the co-offenders continued to attempt to strike him. Bottles were thrown, one hitting him on the back of the head. Blurton, now armed with a wooden picket struck him on the forehead with such force as to snap the picket in two. Both victims managed to get into their vehicle.</p> <p>Objects continued to be thrown at the car. Including a bottle which smashed a window,</p>	<p>offender.</p> <p>In VROI admitted to fighting with victims but denied using anything as a weapon.</p> <p>Sentencing judge found was principal offender.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--

			<p>hitting victim 1 on the jaw and showering him with glass. At the time the victim's wives and a 10 year-old child were in the car.</p> <p>The first victim suffered a laceration to his forehead. The second victim required stitches inside his mouth.</p>		
<i>Transitional provisions repealed (14/01/2009)</i>					
<i>Transitional provisions enacted (31/08/2003)</i>					
<p>Provisions were held to apply to the offence of s 304(2) despite the offence coming into operation after the enactment of the provisions (21/05/2004) in <i>Yates v The State of Western Australia</i> [2008] WASCA 144 overruling the majority decision in <i>The State of Western Australia v Wallam</i> [2008] WASCA 117 on that point.</p>					