

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

<b>Submission No:</b>	72
<b>Submitted by:</b>	Rights in Action (Jerry John, Principal Advocate)
<b>Publication:</b>	Making the submission and your name public
<b>Attachments:</b>	See attachment
<b>Submitter Comments:</b>	

## Submission to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 ("the Bill"). I write to express strong support for legislative reform that prioritises the safety, dignity, and long-term wellbeing of victim-survivors of domestic and family violence (DFV). While I welcome the Queensland Government's commitment to reform in this space, I share the significant concerns also,

#### **Concerns with Police Protection Directions (PPDs)**

PPDs, as proposed, risk shifting the focus away from safety and support towards procedural efficiency for police. Current mechanisms, such as Police Protection Notices (PPNs), already provide immediate safety pathways without bypassing judicial oversight. PPDs instead remove vital legal safeguards, potentially leaving victim-survivors exposed to further harm.

I am particularly concerned about the well-documented and ongoing issue of misidentification, which disproportionately affects Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, LGBTQIA+ communities, and individuals with disability or mental health challenges. Introducing a framework that enables police to issue long-term protection orders without court involvement significantly raises the risk of such misidentification and further entrenchment of systemic injustice.

#### **The Need for Judicial Oversight and Culturally Safe Approaches**

Judicial oversight is a key component of procedural fairness, accountability, and access to support. The removal of court involvement not only limits legal recourse for wrongly identified parties but may also hinder access to specialist DFV services and culturally safe intervention programs especially in rural, remote, and under-resourced regions.

Further, the appeal mechanisms outlined in the Bill place an unfair burden on victim-survivors, particularly those from marginalised backgrounds who may fear police or lack access to legal assistance. These measures risk retraumatising individuals who are already navigating complex and often unsafe situations.

#### **Other Provisions**

I support the expansion of the Video Recorded Evidence-in-Chief (VREC) framework, provided it is accompanied by mandatory, trauma-informed DFV training for all police officers involved in collecting such evidence (This should be ongoing). The removal of this training requirement contradicts key recommendations from the A Call for Change report and from coronial inquests into DFV-related deaths.

Regarding electronic monitoring (EM), I urge the government to engage deeply with DFV services and victim-survivors in its design and implementation, to avoid unintended harms and ensure strong case management supports are in place.

Finally, I support strengthening the Approved Provider List (APL), with clear consultation processes that include Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, and culturally diverse services to ensure the delivery of appropriate, inclusive supports.



### **How this affects PWD,**

From the perspective of people with disability and those of us working in disability advocacy, the proposed reforms, particularly the introduction of Police Protection Directions (PPDs) are deeply troubling. People with disability, especially those with cognitive, psychosocial, or communication disabilities, are already at heightened risk of misidentification, coercion, and exclusion from justice processes. These risks are further compounded when disability is not recognised or understood by frontline responders. The absence of safeguards, judicial oversight, or accessible support mechanisms in the PPD framework means that people with disability may be subjected to punitive measures without being afforded the chance to be heard, supported, or protected. Trauma responses, misunderstood behaviour, or difficulty communicating under pressure should not be criminalised or misread as aggression. The Bill risks replicating a pattern of systemic neglect where people with disability are disproportionately caught up in justice systems not designed for them, and too often punished rather than protected. Any reform of the domestic and family violence system must include specific safeguards for people with disability, co-designed with our communities and representative advocacy organisations.

### **Recommendations**

I urge the Queensland Government to:

- Reject the introduction of PPDs in their current form.
- Prioritise judicial oversight, procedural fairness, and victim-survivor agency in all DFV reforms.
- Invest in frontline DFV services, early intervention, crisis accommodation, and culturally responsive programs.
- Co-design EM and APL reforms with the DFV sector, lived experience advocates, and community-led organisations.
- Fully implement the recommendations of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and the A Call for Change inquiry.

Rights In Action, Jerry John

