

Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee
Queensland Police Union Response
Questions on Notice

On Monday 16 February 2026, representatives of the Queensland Police Union took two questions on Notice. The responses are as below:

Question 1:

Mr McDonald: Could you give us some examples for that or case studies that have been done that don't identify anybody?

Mr Schmidt: I probably can but I would prefer if it was possible to perhaps answer that in writing afterwards just to make sure that I don't disclose anything that I am not allowed to disclose, if you'd be happy with that Chair.

Response:

In respect to instances where the CCC has commenced QCAT proceedings to change sanctions in what the Union considers to be mere tinkering, the following examples of published decisions are provided:

Crime and Corruption Commission v Assistant Commissioner Codd & Anor [2019] QCAT 7. This was a review by CCC as to substantiation of the discipline charge. It had been dismissed by the Assistant Commissioner. The CCC's review was unsuccessful and the Assistant Commissioner's original decision was confirmed by QCAT.

Crime and Corruption Commission v Dawes & Anor [2017] QCAT 66. This involved a failure by an officer to properly investigate a missing person report, where the person was later found deceased. The officer was charged with a breach of discipline, which he admitted. The CCC sought to review the sanction, but the review was dismissed on the basis there was no jurisdiction for the CCC to review discipline breaches. This position was changed with the 2019 amendments to the *Police Service Administration Act* 1990, Part 7, where the CCC was given review rights in relation to all police discipline decisions.

Crime and Corruption Commission v Assistant Commissioner Dawson & Anor [2017] QCAT 37. This matter involved allegations of excessive force. The original sanction was a fine. That fine was increased with both the subject officer and the CCC agreeing as to a proposed increased fine, which QCAT accepted.

Crime & Corruption Commission v Deputy Commissioner Pointing; O'Sullivan v Deputy Commissioner Pointing [2016] QCAT 510. This matter related to an off-duty arrest and excessive force. Both the CCC and subject member reviewed the decision. The CCC's review was unsuccessful, whereas the subject member's was successful, leading to the original sanction being reduced from a suspended demotion to a pay level reduction (effectively a fine).

Crime and Corruption Commission v Acting Deputy Commissioner Barron & Anor [2015] QCAT 96. This matter related to computer access. The subject officer admitted his misconduct and received an original sanction of a pay level reduction (effectively a fine) which was wholly suspended for 12 months, on the basis he complete 80- hours community service. On CCC review, the sanction was changed to a pay level reduction for six months, with 80 hours community service.

Crime and Misconduct Commission v Commissioner of Police & Anor [2013] QCAT 362. This matter involved an allegation of excessive force on a prisoner. The CCC reviewed seeking to substantiate the matter and was unsuccessful.

The QPU is aware there are a numerous matters presently before the QCAT awaiting hearing and/or decision. As those matters are yet to be finalised, the QPU has refrained from providing any details.

The QPU understands on average there are approximately 15 police discipline reviews to QCAT annually, whether brought by the CCC or by subject members.

It remains the QPU position, the CCC should only be reviewing discipline decisions where the CCC believes the sanction should have been either dismissal or actual demotion. The QPU is opposed to the CCC having review rights seeking increases in fines or community service, as such reviews are a poor use of public resources. The QPU believes the CCC should be responsible for preventing, investigating and prosecuting high level or systemic corruption matters. Where there is a failing in a Government Department, including the Queensland Police Service, to maintain adequate standards of discipline, then it is the Director-General or Commissioner who is responsible; which should be the focus of any CCC investigation.

Question 2:

Chair: I might just follow on that line of questioning, thank you. In terms of the removal or abolition of the crime function out of the CCC and divesting that back into the QPS, how many seconded police would be in that role if that was to come about?

Mr Schmidt: Chair we couldn't give you exactly the figures, but it would be *inaudible* we're thinking about 100 police officers are probably seconded down there. I wouldn't say they're evenly split between crime and corruption functionality, but again we could probably address that on questions on notice as well.

Response:

The QPU notes the above response was provided by Mr Prior and not Mr Schmidt.

A search of the QPU members database reveals there are 35 QPU members attached to the CCC. This figure does not include non-members (bearing in mind the QPU has a membership which covers approximately 95% of all eligible members), nor commissioned officers. The QPS is best placed to confirm the current number; however, based on the last available QPS information known to the QPU, in 2024 there were 72.5 FTEs attached to the CCC policing group.