

## Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

<b>Submission No:</b>	1
<b>Submitted by:</b>	lauren Taylor
<b>Publication:</b>	Making the submission and your name public
<b>Attachments:</b>	See attachment
<b>Submitter Comments:</b>	

# DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2025

Submission written by Lauren J Taylor

*With special thanks and dedication to David Crisafulli, Premier of Queensland, Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Amanda Camm, Ali King, former Labor Party member for Pumicestone in the Queensland Legislative Assembly, Micah Projects Marine and Monique, the Department of Child Safety, Queensland Police Service, my dear Ben, Sue and Jillian, the kids, the Federal Circuit Court Of Australia Family Courts Division 1 Evatt case listing provisions, and Registrar's, Independent Children's Advocate Lawyers of Queensland, Peter Hofstee, Queensland Attorney, Julie Harrington, Queensland Attorney, Jo O'hare, Queensland Attorney, James Torcetti, Queensland Attorney, Magistrate and Judiciary representatives of the court, Micah Project's, the newly established Caboolture Womens Hub, Hannah Clarke and her dear children, Daniel M, Jack, and the law created in his honor, my niece Cameila, whom died from domestic violence before she was 18, Lillie James, Toyah Cordingley, Celeste Manno and finally, The Daniel Morcombe Story, Don't Waste it. Without these special elements, people and stories, I would not still have my voice and faith in my heart.*

**I stand for the protection from Domestic Violence, for both Men and Women.**

**All genders, equally, under the law.**

## Summary

I urge the following elements to be taken into consideration, with the new Legislation Amendment Bill proposed, as first hand experience, provided by a victim of the current Domestic Violence Laws and a past Domestic Violence abuse Survivor.

I hope to highlight how the system failed and trapped me as a Victim, allowed another party to weaponize the law to coercively control me, failed my child, and inflicted life long punishment, extending further then the law intended. I also hope to show that this is not a minority issue. Domestic Violence has no gender, and it is not just a physically violent issue.

The system and the intention of legalized amendments in 2025, at present, will create a furthering issue where Domestic violence orders, will have the capacity to destroy more people's future's, as their are no equal amendments to protect victims from being coercively controlled by the law. In doing so, adding to the epidemic of domestic violence in our society. It is necessity for the government to re think its approach to the issue of Family and Domestic Violence.

## Statement

The attitude at present, towards Domestic Violence, steers towards protecting the community from physical domestic violence, at all costs. It undermines the huge impact non physical Domestic and Family violence is having on the community, by dis acknowledging, the fact that, physical violence is not the main element to the over all issue. In some cases the bill amendments proposed, address physical violence, and a police officers workload, but in doing so, they enable non physical Domestic and Family violence, via way of bypassing a Magistrate, and an individual whom has been misidentified, is left to dig their way out with court appeals. If they are able to do so . Unfortunately, no current organisation, can also say, it has the knowledge, to decipher, complex Domestic and Family Violence situations, immediately and accurately.

I wish to outline why Domestic Violence has become an UN manageable situation and what is not being taken seriously by law makers .The missing link, to most extremely violent, Family Abuse and Domestic Violence Situations is future or present family dispute matters, involving children and the impact that disputes, family matters and domestic violence orders, have on people's future.

An individual in family dispute feels as if their is no hope, if they are not supported by the law. A Domestic Violence Order, is what can create a violent escalation of a situation, and does nothing to actually protect a victim from immediate harm.

The conundrum.

**It is in essence " a piece of paper" . Aggie Di Mauro for Celeste Manno. 60 minutes Australia.**

It can be the reason why a woman or man never leaves an abuser.How a person is controlled. Why a person is killed.

An abuser is able to mask themselves, as a victim.

***Support, not surveillance. Help to address the root causes of family stress, to strengthen, and to heal. And to re-start HOPE. ( Family Inclusion Network South-East Queensland, Micah Project's).***

Critical strategies to address extremely violent people and extremely violent domestic abuse cases, categorically, are needed, but not in sacrifice to other forms of non physical Domestic and Family Violence protections.

On the spot domestic violence orders do not fit the mold for necessity if appropriate, streamlined systematic solutions are created, that access, investigate, and isolate a situation before the escalation of a situation repeatedly being physically violent, or becoming physically violent, occurs.

Longer Domestic violence orders, placed immediately, is not an excuse, or a solution to solve the current processing times, for family disputes in the Federal Circuit or specifically the Magistrate Courts. Queensland Police Service have not made it a priority to sort out the short comings of a legal process that does not work for them, and they endeavor to make it easier for themselves, whilst, unfortunately and irresponsibly making it harder for the process of justice.

### **Currently; The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, Explanatory Notes**

**There is currently no framework in Queensland empowering police officers to administratively issue immediate long-term protection directions without filing an application for a proceeding before a court. The DFVP Act currently provides protection to people experiencing DFV by empowering police to take action to protect a person from DFV, including by issuing a Police Protection Notice (PPN), and by enabling a court to make protection orders and temporary protection orders (referred to as a domestic violence order (DVO)). PPNs can be taken to be an application for a protection order and provide immediate protection to the aggrieved until the matter can be heard and decided by a court. As the PPN framework requires court oversight, police are required to prepare, file and serve supporting material and appear in court. PPNs must be considered by courts within 14 business days or the next available sitting day if the court is not sitting within this time. A court may then make a DVO or dismiss the application.**

### **Proposed by the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, Explanatory Notes**

**The Bill will enable police officers to issue a 12-month PPD when responding to DFV that does not require further court consideration. This will provide police with a new tool for responding to DFV instances in circumstances where it is appropriate for the matter not to proceed to court. Providing police with the power to issue PPDs will support front line efficiencies by removing the necessity for operational police officers to prepare for and attend court for the purposes of providing long-term protection.**

**In cases, identifying the person most in need of protection , a police officer will also be prevented from issuing a PPD if there are indications that both persons in the relationship are in need of protection, and the person who is most in need of protection cannot be identified. This is a safeguard against misidentification of the primary aggressor.**

**The consequences of misidentification can be severe and potentially fatal. The wrongly issued PPD may leave a person without protection, subject to criminalisation and systems abuse from the perpetrator, restrict freedom of movement or association, a damaged reputation and create long-lasting stigma which may persist even after the PPD ends.**

***Prior to issuing a PPD, the police officer will also have to make a reasonable attempt to locate and talk to the respondent, if they are not present at the same location as the police officer when making the PPD, to afford the respondent natural justice.***

***By vesting decision making power in a police officer rather than a judicial officer, the rights of the individual are arguably less secure as there may be a perception that a police officer is more prone to bias in decision making than a judicial officer. However, the Bill includes a requirement that an officer proposing to issue a PPD seek approval by an independent senior officer, and provides the ability for parties (aggrieved, respondent, named person, ( authorized person) to seek a police or court review.***

***The principle that legislation should have sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals (section 4(2)(a) of the LSA) will also be impacted by allowing police to arrest a person without a warrant where a police officer reasonably suspects a person has committed or is committing an offence of contravening a PPD (new section 177A of the DFVP Act).***

***In the absence of court oversight of a PPD, this means that there may be circumstances where a person is issued with a PPD, contravenes the PPD and is arrested without having ever been before a court. This impedes on a person's right to natural justice and***

***procedural fairness, and exacerbated in instances where the person may not understand the PPD, or may have been misidentified as the person most in need of protection.***

***This risk is mitigated by the requirement for a court hearing proceedings for a breach of PPD to consider (a) whether the PPD was issued insubstantial compliance with part 4, division 1A of the DFVP Act and, (b) whether the respondent was told about the existence of the PPD or about the condition the respondent is alleged to have contravened. If a PPD is issued and a condition of the PPD is inconsistent with a family law order or an order or agreement under the CPA, the condition is of no effect to the extent of the inconsistency. The inconsistency does not invalidate or otherwise affect the PPD. This safeguards the validity of the PPD and the operation of the order or agreement in the event a respondent or aggrieved do not disclose an order, agreement or proceedings when asked by the police officer.***

Who decides what the inconsistency is? Are the provisions and amendments enough? Why is a loss of justice, and future punishment, acceptable standards, to defend a potential risk? Why are there no less restrictive or reasonably available ways to achieve the purpose of the Bills stated by, Amanda Camm on the Statement of Compatibility, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Offering court or police applications, as the only avenue for reprieve for misidentification, is not achieved by everyone. Why is anyone falling through the cracks of the system, acceptable?

A Magistrate, being forced to make judgement about a Domestic Violence Order based on the construction of legislation amendments is prohibiting judiciary representatives. appointed by the court's, from making decisions based on their true and correct perceptions of the situations.

It facilitates weaponized applications for domestic violence orders and leaves an individual or respondent defenseless, if the applicant has made an application based on legislation rather than evidence.

A Magistrate or Registrar should not be at any point, for any reasons, limited in their capacity to make their true judgement, by law or amendment, especially in the nature of whether or not to pass an order that marks an individual for the rest of their adult life and limits their capacity to be a productive member of society and acquire employment within their chosen profession.

Physical Violence is only one aspect to Domestic Violence.

The Hon, Susan Carter, Shadow Assistant to the Attorney General NSW, submitted in her

second reading to the NSW Parliament, on the 12th of May 2025, that higher penalties are the solution for people who quote “ **might be tempted to commit Domestic Violence** “ ., even though she admits that a penalty after death, for example is hardly an indicator to success. It shows, that we all have allot to learn.

Physical violence often happens after a pattern of behaviors, or a series of arguments, as well as happening at a random rate. Only the **Right Person**, at The **Right Time**, in The **Right Place**, Will immediately discover the truth of Domestic or Family Violence if the situation does not appear to be life threatening. .

Coercive control is often defined as a pattern of controlling behaviour, used by a perpetrator to establish and maintain control over another person. Coercive control is almost always an underlying dynamic of family and domestic violence and intimate partner violence.

Coercive control is a strategic form of ongoing psychological and emotional abuse that is based on control, manipulation, and oppression.

**Recent research, also suggests that vexatious litigants share similar characteristics with domestic violence offenders, namely coercion and control. 3 Examples of these behaviours include: repetitively, instigating proceedings, or trying to take control during already existing proceedings, by applying for access to children, property and pets, and refusing to mediate, accumulating court costs. (Family Law Amendment (Family Violence and Cross-examination of Parties) Bill 2018. Emma Fitch and Patricia Easteal), Parliament of Australia**

What often makes coercive control more damaging is that a person may not recognize they are being controlled or manipulated until their esteem, sense of safety, and autonomy have come undone. Coercive control is seen in “traumatic bonds,” which often occur in abusive relationships fueled by high levels of narcissism; both are based on cycles of intermittent positive and negative reinforcement.

From an emotional, cognitive, and psychological perspective, coercive control can be more damaging to a victim because many times the damage is not immediately seen.

There may be no overt signs and no physical or verbal abuse. This can leave a victim questioning if what they are experiencing is actually mistreatment.

Coercive control and vexatious litigation can be related in that both involve abusive tactics, albeit in different contexts. Coercive control is a form of domestic violence where a person attempts to dominate and control another through various abusive behaviors. Vexatious litigation, on the other hand, involves using the legal system in a way that is abusive, often to harass, intimidate, or delay proceedings.

A state of “over-compliance” means going beyond what is strictly required or necessary in terms of compliance. It involves applying rules, regulations, or standards more strictly than mandated, often leading to inefficiencies or unintended consequences.

A comprehensive definition of violence includes 4 essential elements: behavior that is;

- a) intentional
- b) unwanted
- c) nonessential
- (d) harmful

**Domestic violence includes a wide range of behaviors that control or dominate someone, or cause them to fear for their personal safety or well being. These behaviors may include:**

- Physical or sexual abuse—punching, hitting, choking, or threatening to punch or hit, forcing a person to participate in sexual acts, damaging someone’s property or threatening to damage property, including hurting or threatening to hurt pets
- emotional or psychological abuse—stalking, repeated text messaging, making insulting comments, calling someone names, blackmailing or extorting, preventing contact with family and/or friends, controlling someone’s appearance, putting them down, threatening to expose their sexual orientation
- economic abuse—denying, withholding, controlling or misusing money or property, or threatening to do so.
- threatening behavior—saying things or acting in a way to make someone feel afraid, threatening to commit suicide or self-harm, stalking



- coercive behavior—forcing, intimidating or manipulating a person to do things they don't want to do, such as sign a contract (e.g. for a loan) or a legal document giving another person power over their affairs (e.g. power of attorney).

Domestic violence extends to children seeing violence, like their parent being hurt, being called names, things being broken or police arriving.

**Violence is considered domestic violence when any of the behaviors listed above take place in any of these relationships:**

- an intimate personal relationship—two people (regardless of gender) who are, or were, a couple, engaged, married, in a de facto relationship, the parents of a child or in a registered relationship (a legally recognized relationship between two people regardless of gender)
- a family relationship—two relatives (by marriage or blood), including a child over 18, parent, stepchild, stepparent, brother, sister, grandparent, aunt, uncle, nephew or niece, as for some community groups, a person who is not related by blood or marriage but is considered a relative
- an informal care relationship—one person who is, or was, depending on another person for help with daily living activities. (Note: It is not considered 'domestic' violence when a person is a paid carer under a commercial arrangement.) ( ***what is Domestic Violence? , Queensland Courts*** )

Self applications for Domestic Violence Orders have not been addressed, in the context of coercive control and Family Violence.

**My story**

In 2015, I experienced, Child Safety intervention after, my first child's father, hurt her, at three months old.

I was at that time studying at Gold Coast University Hospital. I was studying a Bachelor in Nursing.

I was marched into the same hospital ward, I was doing my uni practical experience on, by Child Protection Police, in front of teachers and co student's, and placed under supervision with my newborn. Three months after, I gave birth to my first child .

It was not my fault. The shame I felt, was UN describable.

I took my daughter too a nursing practitioner immediately after I found my daughter had been hurt by her father. I had no idea what to do. She told me to go home, ill never forget it. I was swarmed by police, shortly after at home . I was escorted to the Gold Coast University Hospital, and told to leave her at the hospital.

For two weeks I took myself to Nerang Child Safety to see my newborn.

I had no support.

He was charged and incarcerated.

I was then on my own.

I was then in a heavy domestic violence relationship. In 2016.

I moved to Toowoomba, he followed me. At one stage, I tried to removed him from my home myself, and I threw his belongings out my front door and over the fence. He called police on me and I received an on the spot Domestic Violence Order from Toowoomba Police.

He stayed away from me for a few months , and slowly weezled his way back, as I was isolated and had nobody still. Nobody else to rely on, no one to talk to. I became desperate and needed to move from Toowoomba, back to the Gold Coast. He convinced me I could stay at his mother's home.

When I arrived with my belongings he became abusive and I quickly discovered, his mother had absolutely no idea what was going on, so I left.

I sought help from Nerang Police after ending up in a serious situation where my living circumstances were compromised.

My child was removed from me by Nerang Police and Child Safety, and I was escorted to hospital. My child was placed in care and I was released from hospital, homeless without any direct access to my child. Released to a refuge so the hospital could say they sent me to an address. When I was in the refuge my abuser at the time, organised for some of my belongings to be picked up by daughters paternal father.

I ended up going back to the abusive man, he still had all my belongings, whatever was left , and I was homeless and without my child.

I was followed by a private investigator in 2016, whilst in that abusive relationship, in the company of that man , in the following weeks after. He dragged the rest of my belongings onto his front lawn and smashed everything I owned with a baseball bat. Scattered everything. The evidence of that day was used in court proceedings , in a Federal Circuit Court application , which resulted in the removal of my eldest child from my care, indefinitely, and placed her in the paternal grandmother's care. An application, that was made, after Child Safety had returned my daughter to my care.

I had a plan for myself and my daughter and Child Safety was there to help, until, a private application, made by the paternal grandmother. She used a character reference, from my abuser in her application, along with private detective reports and photos .

The father was included in proceedings, but agreed with his mother. The father never made his own applications, he is included in proceedings by law.

It was two on one for many years.

Child Safety intervention and dismissal, in regards to myself.

Domestic Violence Order 22/06/2017- 22/06/2022 my child named on Order.

Self application by paternal grandmother, no police involvement. The allegation was that I tried to take my daughter from daycare.

27/06/ 2017 Domestic Violence Order undefended, and I could not vary Order. I tried. I made my best case to the Magistrate. They were not having any of it .

Naked photos were submitted to Registrar. Of me. Simultaneously. I was accused of being a major drug addict and prostitute. I was bombarded with Child Safety allegations.

Severe drug testing by courts, resulting in a persistent personal appeal to courts not to keep mutilating my hair. The courts and ICL required I be tested so much, my scalp resembled a soccer ball, I had so many chunks of hair missing. They did not even keep a summed record of all the drug testing they had made me do. All the times I mutilated my own hair for testing.

I spent years in supervised contact with my child, until I did enough drug testing that I finally graduated allegations and a return to my care , of the child occurred.

My daughter had developed Global Developmental Disorder and stopped speaking in this time.

The applicant, at one time had committed my child to hospital and tried to falsify child abuse allegations. I was essentially accused of child abuse and dismissed of the allegations by authorities without my understanding or knowledge. I found out only, because the incident was submitted to a Registrar in the Federal Circuit Courts.

I was caught stealing petrol, because I could not afford to meet my Federal Circuit court orders .

Petrie Police would meet me down the end of my street and drug test me and let me go regularly. The paternal grandmother would, make formal and verbal complaints to police in my local area police stations, and i had stolen petrol. It was not a fun time. Child police would show up to my residential address, ask questions, and leave. I was never informed of why. I was kept in an over state of compliance.

I was lucky my ICL in that case was on to it. In that moment. She had investigated me for years without really paying attention.

I also had excellent Child Safety Workers. What set those women apart, is that they had life knowledge, and I wasn't really given an option to complain, because I was supported and given everything I needed to help myself .

I appreciated that they gave me a chance even before they believed me. Or maybe they believed in me, before I believed in myself.

As much as I had previously been bombarded by Child Safety, or Police doing their job. I was lucky in that moment. People were watching . And investigating, finally. I was absolutely stuck in a spiral of allegation and investigating, that i didn't comprehend, nor did I grasp the entirety of, until after the fact.

The outcome of those Federal Circuit Court proceedings, and rather that block of situation was in 2020, and the child was returned to my full time care. I gained sole parental responsibility.

I couldn't report the false allegations of child abuse to the police. Or the Fake naked photos, submitted to grown men in the Registrar about me. I could do nothing about being followed by private investigators. Or that certain people, helped themselves to and destroyed my belongings. I had to accept that my young children and I were traumatized and seek guidance to help support me with that. I still looked over my shoulder.

I moved on, and I moved to a new suburb to start a new life in Moreton Bay.

New Federal Court Application 2021 resulting in child being removed from my care. No Child Safety involvement. No Legal Aid.

Child was removed from my care, at her school, in-front of the entire assembly leaving at 2:30pm. It was publicly announced over the speaker. We were told to say goodbye and leave.

I did not see her again for over 6 months after that. Looking over my shoulder became secondary. I took her sister to Prep the next year, at that same school. It was hard.

I was bombarded with Child Safety allegations.

Admitted myself to the Mental Health Ward, Caboolture Hospital in that time. I even called Child Safety at Morayfeild and told them to come and pick up my other two babies.

I'm so happy they ignored me. I couldn't fathom how I could have two babies in my care but not my eldest. My mental health was not OK.

Another Domestic Violence Order application by original applicant in 2022. Paternal grandmother, made a self application through Magistrate Courts, no police involvement, occurred. The allegation, was that I tried to take my daughter from school. The exact same excuse as before. Domestic Violence Order extended.

I Applied for a Domestic Violence Order against applicant, paternal grandmother, in Caboolture Magistrate Court, and was refused in 2022. I could not afford a representative and I was too emotionally dis regulated to decipher the legal process myself.

I was breached as respondent , on Domestic Violence Order.

The Federal Court orders dictate I must converse with applicant ( paternal grandmother) for child.

Domestic violence orders dictate I'm not even allowed within 100m of child, paternal grandmother, or father. Cannot communicate outside of very vague scope of Federal Circuit Court Orders.

I was charged for communication out of scope of contact, on Domestic Violence Order, breached by applicant. Charged by police.

I had a complete mental breakdown, in lock up cells, at Caboolture Police Station.

The remarks by the Magistrate, were that I had better get it together, and if I was in-front of him again he would incarcerate me.

Child Safety Letter outcome, Child not in need of protection. Child Safety Dismissal, after I requested Child Safety be involved in my matter.

The outcome of Proceedings 05/ 2024. I was granted sole parental responsibility. Applicant reduced in contact and communication. I am only required to update father on medical information at present, and we have not conversed in 10 years.

In this time I birthed two more children. The child in question is my eldest. I have never had Child Safety or court intervention for the other two children in my care.

I obtained IFS, community support services, to bridge the constant Child Safety allegations being made about me. My support worker, had on occasion, acted as a character reference for the Police and Child Safety. There were times I felt my IFS officer came to my rescue in that regard. It was consistent and constant allegations.

I was scolded by the Federal Registrar for the third removal of my own child, because I breached my orders by not sending my child on contact to the paternal grandmother, at that time. That was the justification for my child being removed immediately from school, and my family being publicly shamed in-front of our entire assembly. I had no idea that I needed to make another application to the Federal Circuit Courts, if I wanted to prove that the other party was inflicting purposeful damage on my family unit, and that I couldn't just not send my child if the other party was being abusive. It was an unfortunate experience.

A Domestic Violence Order appeal to the courts is not presently available under legal aid. As my Domestic Violence Order was granted, then extended, and then I was breached, I have no understanding of how to appeal that situation moving forward, myself. I only have my Federal Orders that protect me from being forced to communicate with an individual, I fail to, repeatedly, at my own peril, to the best of my ability, and an individual that has used my own information for personal gain and control. I am however, punished, further than the law intended.

I currently have huge student loans, and as I chose Nursing, I am permitted from obtaining a Nursing License, as Aprah would generally not accept a Domestic Violence Order or breaches of Domestic Violence Order, as acceptable, on an application for license. I intended to utilize the government's education subsidies, however it is a long degree to study, to then be refused a licence by Aprah.

If breaches of Domestic Violence Orders are also listed as non negotiable for NDIS, a blue Card, or Working With Children, checks, I am also ineligible. A possible future with any organisation that does a criminal history check, will from here on out, most likely deny me employment opportunities, because of my family dispute, and Domestic Violence Order History. For me personally, the two are intertwined issues.

I cannot hope to build on the education I already possess after having children. I am also limited in my capacity to pay off debt I no longer, possess the ability to make use of practically. I have been tasked with the extreme hardship of trying to convince Griffith University to release, forgive, cancel, my course fees. I was allowed to keep enrolling in courses during the years of 2015 - 2017. I feel looking back, it was an attempt to hold my self worth together. I was not capable of doing the work . I can see that now. My student loans are up to around 50 thousand dollars. I have completed a diploma in health, business, and hospitality. However unfortunately a large portion of my student loans are from Griffith University, for incomplete courses and my initial attempts at having my loans reviewed were met with absolute confusion and absolutely no support from the university. I do not expect them to review my loans easily. It is futile.

I feel the same way about the navigation of the legal process to have my Domestic Violence Orders reviewed. The process is futile. Especially without endless money for litigation. To say I am stuck is an under statement. I am 35. Without savings and a mother of three children. When my youngest child turns six, my plan for our future has been extremely limited. I've lost almost ten years in family dispute, arguing, and being stripped of every inch of my self worth. I am struggling to, develop a strategy on where to begin. I once thought i could save lives.

I believe it is also important to discuss and disclose, that upon my plea of Guilty, for petrol theft at Caboolture Magistrate Court, I was placed in Open Court. I was at the time in the Federal Circuit Family Courts, Division 1 Evatt Case listing. My matter in Caboolture Magistrate Court, was published in the Courier Mail. It was headed, Lauren Jade Taylor sentenced for stealing \$370 worth of petrol 9 Sept 2020 — A former nurse who stole petrol from five service stations across the southeast told police she did not pay because she was a single mum. I was gobsmacked. My attempts to request Google to remove it were rejected and the Courier Mail is to big a giant for me to do anything about the truth of the article. It is beyond my financial and emotional means.

I may be able to block public shaming out, however most cannot. I am responsible for my actions, but not for the situations I was forced into. Inconsistency in court orders can be a huge affliction to an individual. The Courier Mail's article did not affect my matter as it was extremely far in its progress and the Federal Circuit Court knew of my afflictions and my charges. I had been transparent and vocal. That will be different for another individual. The article is on goggle for life. Some commit suicide over things like this and severe family dispute matters.



## **Considerations**

**The Charter of Rights For Parents**, formed by the Family Inclusion Network South-East Queensland, Micah Project's, As a parent in Queensland, when you are involved in child protection matters, you have the right to ...

**1 Recognition and equality**

**2 Information and freedom of expression**

**3 Legal representation and a fair hearing**

**4 Protection of family**

**5 Support**

**6 Culture — generally**

**7 Culture — Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islander peoples**

**8 Privacy, confidentiality and reputation**

**Qld Human Rights Act Review - June 2024, FIN used parents' views and ideas to make a submission into the independent review of the Queensland Human Rights Act 2019. Prof. Susan Harris Rimmer invited stakeholders from across Queensland to provide feedback on experiences of the Human Rights Act 2019. FIN's suggestions focused on parents and families experiencing the child protection system, including: A simplified, independent complaints process for parents and families experiencing child protection intervention.**

**A focus of discussion was a register of civil litigation that could improve the performance of agencies in their human rights obligations Information sessions and/or 'drop ins' in partnership with community organisations (such as Micah Projects) that work with families impacted by Child Safety intervention. Partner to establish a trial of a 'family defender' or 'family reunification' community legal service that focuses on child protection**

**There is a massive power imbalance between the system and the parent, and there is a focus on ‘winning’ not on the best outcome for the child and family. Parents are focusing on the future for their children and young people but the process is creating disconnection: not only separating children from their parents, but also separating parents from each other, separating the child from their extended family and kin, and separating children from their siblings. This seems to contradict Queensland’s Child Protection Benchbook 2023, which states: “ As well as applying the principles of the Director of Child Protection Litigation Act 2016 (Qld), the DCPL, as a representative of the State, has a duty to exercise its statutory functions in accordance with model litigant principles. Model litigant principles reflect the court’s and the community’s expectation that the State will conduct litigation in a way that is firm and fair. Model litigant principles state that fairness will be achieved when litigation is conducted promptly, efficiently, consistently and proportionately and in a manner that does not take advantage of another party’s limited financial or other means. Child protection proceedings are unique and should not be conducted in a manner that is overly adversarial. Similarly, court outcomes should not be thought of in terms of ‘winning’ or ‘losing’ the case. Instead, the DCPL’s overarching obligation is to assist the court to make a fully informed decision in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the safety, well-being and best interests of the child, both through childhood and for the rest of the child’s life.” ( Child Protection Litigation Model’ Review Family Inclusion Network (FIN)**

**In 2013, the Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry found that, “establishing an adequately resourcing an effective family support sector is the unfinished business of the 1998–99 Forde Inquiry and the 2003–04 CMC Inquiry.” ( Family Inclusion Network South-East Queensland, Micah Project’s) .**

**Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry**

**Child Safety workforce survey report June 2013,**

**Executive summary**

## **Commissioner Tim Carmody, QC, presented his final reports to the Queensland Government on July 1, 2013**

The Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry was established on 1 July 2012. The Commission's terms of reference include examining the effectiveness of the current Queensland government response to children and families in the child protection system, including the appropriateness of the level of, and support for, front-line staffing.

To inform its deliberations the Commission undertook a survey of front-line Child Safety staff between 28 November 2012 and 12 December 2012. The survey was open to all staff working in the positions of child safety support officer, child safety officer, family group meeting convenor, court coordinator, senior practitioner, team leader, manager and other positions deemed by Child safety to be front-line. The survey sought the views of front-line staff about a wide range of child protection and workforce matters, including their views about qualifications and training, supervision, cultural competencies, acting and higher duties, being valued and supported, the Integrated Client Management System, the Child Safety Practice Manual and related policies, the use of Structured Decision Making tools, casework, professional relationships, the Child Safety After Hours Service, and court work. A total of 444 responses were received, mostly from Child Safety officers, team leaders and child safety support officers. Responses were received from 31 per cent of those eligible to participate. Overall, 94 per cent of respondents reported having some form of tertiary qualification ranging from certificate to doctoral level with 88.9 per cent of respondents holding a bachelor level qualification or higher. This report provides an overview of the quantitative and qualitative responses to the survey. Key findings are summarised below.

### **Training, supervision and professional development**

☐ Just over half (53%) of all child safety officers had completed their child safety officer entry level training at the time of survey and about half of these (47%) agreed that this training was helpful in developing the skills and knowledge they needed to perform their role. Many felt that this training should be more 'practice-oriented' and focused on real-life scenarios.

☐ Eighty per cent of respondents reported having opportunities for professional development, other than entry level training. Just over half (59%) agreed that the training they had received in Child Safety has been adequate for them to perform their role. Many felt that demands of high case loads and inability to backfill positions meant that officers often had very little time to attend additional training courses.

▣ Less than half of the respondents reported receiving scheduled formal supervision (44%) as part of their role and more than half (55%) reported their supervision was mainly administrative in nature. Most agreed that supervision should provide opportunities to discuss professional and personal development, in addition to administrative matters. Many also felt that external supervision would be an effective way to improve current supervision arrangements.

▣ Overall, only a small minority of respondents (18%) agreed with the proposition that Child Safety is an organisation that invests in the professional development of its workforce. A large number of respondents suggested that a dedicated training 'budget' should be available to assist officers who wished to attend training and that case-loads should be reduced or backfilled while officers attend training.

### **Working with children and families**

▣ Most respondents (70%) agreed that their case-loads had increased over time, and just over a third (38%) felt their current case-loads were manageable. Only a quarter (27%) felt their role had an appropriate balance between administrative tasks, court processes and front-line service delivery. On average, respondents estimated that 60 per cent of their time was spent on administration and 20 per cent on court work.

▣ Less than one quarter of respondents (23%) felt that they were able to spend enough time with children and families to be able to form productive relationships. Respondents proposed three key improvements to making case-load more manageable. These were reducing administrative work, capping or reducing case loads, and increasing recruitment of administrative staff and child safety officers.

▣ Respondents were least confident working with children and families from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, people with disabilities, and people with mental health problems. While 84 per cent of respondents felt confident that they had the skills to work effectively with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families, only 22 per cent of their colleagues who identified as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreed with this statement.

▣ Approximately one third of respondents (37%) reported that they had completed cultural competency training within the last two years. Most respondents considered ongoing training and education as important to improve cultural competencies of staff. However,

many suggested that regular and proactive engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and other culturally and linguistically diverse groups was a more effective method of building cultural competency 'on the job' than internal training sessions. Structured decision making, the practice manual and information technology

▣ A large majority of child safety officers reported using their professional judgement in conjunction with Structured Decision Making tools (95%) and that they are supported to do so(80%). However, in practice, about one quarter (24%) reported never overriding Structured Decision Making tools. Some respondents suggested that better training be provided to officers on the proper purpose and use of decision-making tools. It was a widely held view that decision-making tools should only be used as a guide to inform practice.

▣ A large number of respondents (82%) agreed that the Child Safety Practice Manual is a useful resource. However, only half felt that the manual was easy to use (52%), was well structured(54%) or set a standard of practice that was achievable (53%). Some respondents commented that the manual was 'too prescriptive' and should only be used as one of many guides to inform decision-making, without replacing the need to exercise professional judgment.

▣ Just over half of respondents agreed that the Child Safety Integrated Client Management System supports their practice (66%), allows information to be entered quickly (51%) and allowed easy access to information (58%). However, less than half felt the system provided all the information they needed (43%) or that it was reliable (42%). The most common suggestion for improving the system was to streamline data entry to avoid duplicating the same information across different forms.

## **Court and legal matters**

▣ Approximately three quarters of respondents (77%) felt they had a good understanding of court and tribunal processes, whereas just under a third (32%) felt local Children's Court judges and magistrates had a good understanding of child protection issues. Even so, less

than half of all respondents (47%) reported having access to timely and appropriate legal advice in relation to their role. Three key areas were identified for improving court related work. These were better training and education for Children's Court judges and magistrates, access to legally qualified court coordinators, and improving the training provided to child safety officers and other departmental staff in the preparation of legal documentation.

## **Professional relationships**

☐ Most respondents reported having productive relationships with local public schools (86%) and government agencies, including the Queensland Police Service (85%) and Queensland

Health (78%). Most respondents felt that relationships with external agencies would improve if those agencies had a better understanding of the department's role and objectives in child protection work.

☐ Although a large majority of respondents (90%) also reported having productive relationships with local non-government organisations, less than half (44%) felt confident that these organisations were able to effectively deliver their services. Some respondents suggested that more non-government organisations were required to ensure the timely delivery of services to children and families.

☐ Just over three quarters (78%) of those who had regular contact with community visitors described their relationship with them to be positive. Just over half (57%) felt community visitors play an important role in ensuring the needs of children and young people in out-of-home care are met. Being valued and supported

☐ Most respondents felt their work as a child protection worker is valued within their team (83%) and their Child Safety service centre (71%), but were much less likely to feel their work was valued within their broader organisation (42%) or the wider community (39%). While most felt their workplace is supportive of its staff (69%) and that their colleagues and managers supported their decisions (75%), around half felt they were listened to when raising issues or concerns (53%). Only about a third (35%) agreed with the proposition that Child Safety is an organisation that supports innovative practice.

☐ It was suggested that staff would feel more supported in their roles if there was open and transparent communication between front-line staff and management, including the opportunity for debriefing with senior staff. Front-line staff also suggested that greater recognition of the emotional stress involved in child protection work would improve the

level of staff support. Another suggestion for improving staff support is to backfill roles during leave periods and when employees are acting in higher positions.

Comparison to non-government work force . As part of its enquiries, the Commission has also undertaken a survey of the non-government child protection workforce. There were similarities between the results of the two surveys but also points of significant departure. The most notable differences related to the perceived case-loads, professional development and support for innovation. The two groups also had different views about the value of their work within their organisations and communities. Both Child Safety and non-government employees reported that there had been an increase in their workloads over time (70% compared to 77%). However, non-government employees were much more likely to feel that their workloads had remained manageable (71% compared to 38%). Non-government staff were also more likely to report having an appropriate balance between administrative tasks and front-line service delivery (65% compared to 23%) and having enough time to form productive relationships with children and families (70% compared to 23%).

Meanwhile, non-government employees are more likely to feel that their organisation supports innovative practice (70% compared to 35%) and invests in their professional development (63% compared to 18%). Supporting this view, there appears to be a marked difference in the use of supervision between the two sectors. Whereas 77 per cent of non-government employees reported having formal scheduled supervision, this was the case for only 44 per cent of Child Safety employees. Both sets of employees felt that regular supervision was a vital part of supporting front-line staff and that it should be more focused on practice than administrative tasks.

Although both Child Safety and non-government employees felt that their work was valued within their immediate work teams (83% compared to 86%), Child Safety employees were less likely to feel their work was valued within their larger organisation (42% compared to 69%) or the wider community (39% compared to 72%). Both groups highlighted the quality of management as a key factor in helping front-line staff feel valued and supported. Both felt that it was particularly important for managers to have strong communication skills, be proactive in helping employees deal with the emotional strain of child protection work and be available when critical incidents occur. ( Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry , Child Safety workforce survey report, June 2013 )

### **Legal representation and Fair Haring, Legal Aid**

Legal Aid will see you as, not needing funding ; if you have an application lodged against you , no child safety intervention, and parental responsibility. The system process is lacking in that regard.

Children can be named, on a self application for Domestic Violence Order in a Magistrate Court , based on allegations by an applicant with no proven background, or evidence. In some instance's a Magistrate is already legally obligated, not to reject an application for a Domestic Violence Order.

If the laws were to amend sole parents to change a child's name, without the consent of another, what happens, if in Federal Court Proceedings, the child changes sole parental care ? Their have been no provisions or considerations made . What also happens if an individual, unlawfully, hides a child from another parent, violating the child's right to a relationship with both parents?

Treating all Domestic Violence as such, is a large over sight and extensive mis management by the government, in order to protect our most vulnerable. If the system is not bombarded by litigants using it to weaponize their own agenda, and false allegations, their will also be more time to help the children in need.

If all allegations are investigated at a lower level, before reaching a child's living situation, a Registrar will have an informed system in which to approach a child's living and care situation.

Child safety or the police is not sought, to investigate all and any allegations about child in a Magistrate or Federal Court. It can have serious ramifications on a parental dispute, and a child's stability during ;Private ( Not including Child Safety) Federal Court Proceedings, Or Magistrate Court Applications for Domestic Violence Orders.

Their is currently no support, for such purpose In the magistrate court.

An ICL, Independent Children's Advocate Lawyer, still relies on the information they subpoena, from another party. Generally Child Safety. They are also generally many cases down and do not just oversee one child.

Information best presented to Federal Registrar or Magistrate on day, by the Applicant or ICL . serves purpose. At present.



A registry of information could curb this issue, however if previous steps are not taken into account, especially, any and all allegations investigated, before a Domestic Violence Order is placed, a Registrar could receive the wrong information from a Magistrate, in retrospect to child dispute or any child abuse allegations.

It leaves parents in an extremely vulnerable position. They are not supported by the law in that regard, but can have lack of information rather used against them.

A Federal registrar may see a weaponized Domestic Violence Order and it may distort their view of outcome.

This is how coercive control is facilitated in retrospect to family violence. It is a means of control by another party and an attempt to limit a person's autonomy or reputation. It is a way in which to use the law to affect a child's living arrangements and affect another parent rights.

In the same retrospect. Each private Federal Circuit Court Application in turn, can also be held by a new registrar. The registry of information needs to be in one place.

### **Legal representation and Fair Hearing, Privacy and Reputation**

In retrospect to Reputation and Privacy. Human Rights. With every Private Federal Circuit Court application, the Applicant has access to a consistent flow of information for up to the unlimited length of litigation with repeat court Applications. Censorship of particular personal information, especially in regards to psychologist and doctors information is needed automatically in ongoing family child disputes. Otherwise it gives the applicant the ability to monitor an individual, and inflict constant physiological abuse through the form of allegations, in an ongoing dispute. Specifically keeping another in a state of over compliance.

Private investigator reports, privately obtained, in child related and parental matters, in Federal Courts Proceedings and Domestic Violence Orders, need to be struck from use, to deter others from using the law as an excuse to monitor and intimidate others. The accuracy of the information source also needs to be questioned.

Consideration to also be given, if a child is removed from a current caregiver, to the caregivers reputation, social setting, and privacy. A parent, to not be publicly humiliated in a social setting at a school, learning, or workplace. A human rights aspect.

The Government needs to give the power back to the departments that are their to do their job, like the Department of Child Safety and allow them the power and the resources to investigate child allegations.

I understand the weight of that work is heavy. However, in time I also hope that a vigorous investigative tactic in this situation, will also have the capacity to reduce the work load .

Presently there is little to stop the law being weaponized, so anything can be said in a family dispute proceeding.

If all allegations are investigated, it may eventually deter others from taking the approach that they will accuse another party of anything and everything, thus limiting the time in a family dispute court setting, or limiting the time to investigate real time child abuse allegations. Also limiting the time a child or parent is impacted by the system or any court proceedings.

### **Legal representation and Fair Hearing, Police Solutions**

Alternative ways of achieving policy objectives, Police Protection Directions , Alternative ways of reducing the operational impacts of the current DFV legislative framework were considered, however, were deemed insufficient to improve efficiencies and police responses to DFV. For example, consideration was given to maintaining the status quo of police officers issuing PPNs and courts making DVOs and, restricting the issue of PPDs to standard conditions only. However, this would not improve efficiencies for front-line police officers as court processes would continue to be required for PPNs and, where conditions other than standard conditions are necessary or desirable to protect a person from domestic violence. That is the opinion expressed via the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 Explanatory Notes.

### **A proposal;**

Child Safety, in the Magistrate Domestic Violence support faction, or an individual support , to investigate allegations, that involve a child's need for protection from parent or caregiver.

Private Federal Circuit Court Applications, Child Safety Support, or individual support, to investigate any application that involves a child's change of residential address, or parental caregiver, in retrospect to the Family Law Act 1975. A child's right to have a relationship with both parents, and the right to representation on behalf of the child and parent.

Funding be issued to the Department of Child Safety in order to reform its systems and update its Domestic Violence tools.

Child Safety and Queensland Police update or assemble a Domestic Violence Response team, that also works closely with Domestic Violence parental advocates and other community resources to combat Domestic Violence in the community.

Funding be issued to organisations like Micah Projects, Family Inclusion Network, or such projects to support the Department of Child Safety the Queensland Police Service, in delivering education and intervention to the community.

An adequate tool is created ,in the form of information sharing , it will create a multi level platform in which the police, magistrate, child safety and registrar can access and provide up to date information, in which enables a matter to be addressed, timely and effectively, throughout the multi level process of law. It is not just about giving the Federal registrar and Magistrate access to information, it is also about giving them everything they need to make an informed decision and delivering a multi level solution.

Child Safety Intervention- Systematic Reboot, introduction of an experienced based competency system, similarly to that of a nursing classification system AIN /EN / RN , revised decision making processes. Keep the experience in child safety, with salary packages to reflect experience and worker classification, also responsibilities. A chance to adjust Child Safety's trust within the community. Police protection to focus on violent and physical Domestic Violence, Child Safety intervention Support to initiate and investigate family dispute, and matters involving children.

A systematic approach to protecting the rights of all individuals and re arranging the system to work effectively, and expansively. Transparent and up to date information for experienced decision makers, and those involved in proceedings, also, a level of protection from other forms of systems abuse, coercive control, parental alienation, and family abuse.

Representation and Fair Hearing on behalf of the parent, and Domestic Violence matters, be automatically issued aid by legal Aid for the parent or respondent.

In retrospect to extremely violent Domestic Violence, I propose, police powers be initiated and drafted, that allows them to intercept, investigate, and isolate, violence before and after it happens. Perpetrators, meeting a threshold, before they are treated as extremely

violent Domestic Abusers. Police obtaining powers to isolate a situation, in order to discover the facts.

Such changes would enable stability and voice for parents and children in any dispute or Domestic Violence process . It also protects the system from being used as a weapon to destabilize another, whilst distorting a law of judgement makers view.

## **References**

Queensland Legislation Domestic and Family Violence Protection and

Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

Explanatory Notes

Policy objectives and the reasons for them

Available at : [/www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/pdf/bill.first.exp/bill-2025-024](http://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/pdf/bill.first.exp/bill-2025-024)

**Family Inclusion Network South-East Queensland Micha Projects**

**Global Day of Parents flyer**

102 Main St, Kangaroo Point QLD 4169, [info@finseq.org.au](mailto:info@finseq.org.au), ph 07 30136030

**Parliament of Australia**

Accessed May 2025 , Available at: <https://www.aph.gov.au>

**Ways to improve Parliament Of Australia**

(Family Law Amendment (Family Violence and Cross-examination of Parties) Bill 2018 [Provisions] Submission 5 - Attachment 2 ) Emma Fitch and Patricia Easteal), Vexatious litigation in family law and coercive control, Accessed May 2025 , Available at : <chrome-native://pdf/link?url=content%3A%2F%2Fmedia%2Fexternal%2Fdownloads%2F1000000499>

### **What is Domestic Violence?**

Queensland Courts, Accessed May 2025 , Available at: <https://www.courts.qld.gov.au/going-to-court/domestic-violence/what-is-domestic-violence#:~:text=Behaviours%20that%20are%20domestic%20violence&text=These%20behaviours%20may%20include%3A,or%20threatening%20to%20hurt%20pets>

### **Micha Project's Resources**

Family Inclusion Network South-East Queensland

Accessed May 2025 , Available at: <https://finseq.org.au/resources>

### **Charter of Rights for parents involved with the child protection system in Queensland**

Family Inclusion Network Micha Project's South-East Queensland

Accessed May 2025 , Available at: <https://finseq.org.au/resources>

**Child Protection Litigation Model' Review** Family Inclusion Network (FIN) Consultation with parents – May 2024 Family Inclusion Network Micha Project's South-East Queensland

Accessed May 2025 , Available at: <https://finseq.org.au/resources>

### **Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry , Child Safety workforce survey report**

Accessed May 2025 , Available at : [June 2013, Child Safety Workforce Survey Report.pdf<sup>1</sup>](#)