
ISSUES PAPER: **REVIEW OF THE** ***SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT***

October 2010

Legal Policy Division, Policy Coordination

Department of Justice

This paper is being released for discussion purposes only and any views expressed are not to be taken to represent the views of the Northern Territory Government, the Northern Territory Minister for Justice and Attorney-General or the Department of Justice.

Contents

Consultation..	5
Stakeholder Consultations	5
Summary of the Operation of Current Provisions.	6
Summary of the Recommendations	6
Submissions	5
INTRODUCTION.	6
Objects of the Act	6
Issues.	6
POLICY POSITIONS.	7
(i) Duplication.	7
(ii) Relevance.	7
(iii) Status Offences	7
(iv) Consistency with criminal law principles	8
(v) Burden of Proof.	8
(vi) Frequency of usage	8
(vii) More appropriate location elsewhere	8
(viii) Penalties – general principles	9
(ix) Penalties – reviewed	10
Other Options	10
Redrafting	10
Comparisons with other Jurisdictions	10
PUBLIC ORDER	12
LANGUAGE	14
SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT	16
1. LIQUOR RELATED OFFENCES AND POWERS.	17
Part VIA drinking in public places	17
Sections 45C – 45K	17
Recommendation for Part VIA.	17
2. PUBLIC ORDER OFFENCES.	18
Section 47 Offensive, &c., conduct.	18
Offensive Behaviour	18
Disorderly Behaviour	19
Indecent Behaviour.	19
Section 74A – Disorderly behaviour in public	21
Section 7 – Disorderly or offensive conduct or language	21
Section 6 – Public Nuisance	22
Section 392 – Offensive behaviour.	22
BREAKDOWN OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY OFFENCE.	23
Section 47(a)	23
Section 47(b)	24
Section 47(c)	24
Section 47(d)	24
Section 47(e)	25
Section 47(f)	25
THE FAULT ELEMENT OF THE OFFENCE	26
Section 47AA – Violent Disorder	27
Section 47AB – Threatening Violence	28
3. LOITERING OFFENCES	29
Section 47AC – Loitering By Sexual Offender	30
Section 47A – Loitering General Offence:	31
Section 47B – Loitering – Offence Following Notice.	32
Section 55 – Challenge to Fight.	34
Section 55A – Consorting Between Known Offenders	35
Section 56 – Offences	36

	Section 56(1)(c)	37
	Section 56(1)(e)	38
	Section 56(1)(i)	39
	Section 57 – Offences After Finding of Guilt Under Section 56, &c.	40
	Section 57(1)(a)	41
	Section 57(1)(b)	41
	Section 57(1)(d)	41
	Section 57(1)(e)	41
	Section 57(1)(l)	42
	Section 57(1)(p)	42
	Section 58 – Penalty for Second or Subsequent Offence under Section 57	43
	Section 69B – Inciting to the Commission of Offences	43
	Section 74 – Power to Regulate Traffic in Certain Cases	43
	Section 75 – Prohibition of Nuisances in Thoroughfares	45
	GRAFFITI	46
	Section 76 – Playing Musical Instruments so as to annoy	48
4.	NOISE PROVISIONS	50
	Section 53A – Undue Noise at Social Gathering after Midnight	50
	Section 53B – Undue Noise	50
	Section 53C – Certificate of Member of the Police Force to be Evidence	51
	Section 53D – Noise Abatement Orders	51
	Section 53E – Powers of Police	51
	Section 53F – Compliance with direction	52
5.	TRESPASS OFFENCES	53
	Section 46A – Forcible Entry	53
	Section 46B – Forcible Detainer	53
6.	DISHONESTY OFFENCES	54
	Section 49A – Illegal Use of Vehicle, &c.	54
	Section 54 – Stealing Domestic Animals	55
	Section 60 – Valueless Cheques	55
	Section 60A – Fraud Other than False Pretences	56
	Section 61 – Persons Suspected of Having Stolen Goods:	56
	Section 62 – Where Property Improperly Taken or Stolen is Found and Not Satisfactorily Accounted For	58
	Section 65A – Tampering with Instruments	60
7.	INDECENCY OR OBSCENITY OFFENCES	62
	Section 50 – Penalty for Indecent Exposure of the Person	62
	Section 53 – Obscenity	63
	53(1)(a)(i)	64
	53(7)(a)	64
8.	MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES	66
	Section 46C – Disturbing Religious Worship	66
	Section 52 Injuring or Extinguishing Street Lamps	66
	Section 65AA Dumping of Certain Containers	67
	Section 66 – Regulation of Places of Public Resort	67
	Section 68A – False Reports to Police	68
	Section 68B – Advertising a Reward for the Return of Stolen Property	68
	Section 69 – Penalty For Offences Where no Special Penalty is Appointed	69
	Section 69A – Disobedience to Laws of The Territory	69
	Section 75A – Dangerous Dogs	70
	Section 78 – Keeping Clean Yards, &c.	71
	Section 82 – Offences Relating to Public Fountains	71
	Section 85 – Leaving Dead Animals in Public Place	72
	Section 89 – Cellars or Openings beneath the Surface of Footpaths Prohibited	72
	Section 91AA – Regulatory Offences	73
	Section 92 – Regulations	73

SHOULD WE RETAIN THE <i>SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT</i>?	74
OTHER ASSOCIATED MATTERS	75
Misbehaviour at a public meeting	75
11. Victimization as to employment and delivery of goods	76
FINAL THOUGHT	75
<i>SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT</i> REVIEW: SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS	76
Note re Graffiti	83
Footnotes	83

Consultation

Comments are sought from stakeholders and the general public concerning the operation of the *Summary Offences Act* (SOA) and options for the reform of that Act. To assist potential comment, the Department of Justice has prepared this issues paper. It contains a discussion of the contents of the current legislation and sets out a number of proposals concerning the possible reform of the legislation.

Stakeholder Consultations

For the purpose of developing this issues paper, consultations have been held with members of the NT Police, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, Summary Prosecutions, Northern Territory Legal Aid Commission, NAAJA, CAALAS, the Criminal Bar, and the Law Society regarding the changes to the SOA. The Police, NAAJA and the Law Society have been particularly helpful and frank in discussions with the Department of Justice.

Summary of the Operation of Current Provisions

Attachment A contains a table listing each of the current provisions and its frequency of use.

Summary of the Recommendations

Attachment A also contains a summary of the proposals in relation to future policy. A more detailed discussion of the provisions is set out in the rest of this issues paper.

Submissions

Comments on the paper are sought.

They should be sent by 14 January 2011 to:

Acting Director, Legal Policy
Department of Justice
GPO Box 1722 Darwin
Email: Policy.Doj@nt.gov.au

The responsible officer is Mr Martin Fisher whose contact details are as follows:

Telephone: 8935 7651
Email: martin.fisher@nt.gov.au

INTRODUCTION

“It is often said that history is best to be found in the rubbish tips. The Police Act is an active tip within which layer upon layer of the social history of our society can be found.”¹

The *Summary Offences Act* (NT) (SOA) started life as the *Police and Police Offences Ordinance* in 1924. It was taken in a large part from the South Australian *Police Act 1869*. The parts of the Act relating to Police Procedure and duties were excised from the Act when the *Police Administration Act* was introduced.

It has been through 95 re-enactments, with nearly half the Act being repealed, but still retains many outdated provisions, uses archaic language, and needs dragging into the 21st Century.

The Act also needs to comply with the criminal responsibility provisions of Part IIAA of the Northern Territory Criminal Code (the Criminal Code).

Objects of the Act

The SOA provides a framework for lesser, non-indictable offences, dealing with largely minor anti-social behaviour and providing powers to Police to manage that behaviour.

Issues

- What framework should the Government have for these types of behaviours?
- When and in what circumstances is it appropriate to criminalise nuisance behaviour?
- What should the Government’s policy be regarding public order legislation?

The SOA is a home for provisions dealing with public order and like matters and we need to ask these questions:

- (i) Which provisions should be retained?
- (ii) Which provisions should be replaced or rewritten?
- (iii) Which provisions should be removed?
- (iv) Are there any other offences which should be placed in the Act?

Once these questions are answered then we ask:

- (v) Should the Act be merely amended, or repealed and replaced with another SOA. Whether called by that name or another, such as *Public Order Offences Act* or *Summary Offences (Public Order) Act* or something similar?
- (vi) Should the entire SOA be repealed and those offences worth keeping put into other more appropriate Acts, such as the Criminal Code, the *Trespass Act*, the *Liquor Act* and the *Traffic Act*?

¹ Quoted from Burt CJ of the Western Australian Supreme Court.

POLICY POSITIONS

While some provisions in the SOA are in regular use, most offences currently in it should be repealed, amended or replaced for one or more of the following reasons:

(i) Duplication

Where an offence in the SOA is broadly similar to an offence in another Act, one of them can be eliminated.

The reference to ‘deleterious drugs’² for example is taken care of in the *Misuse of Drugs Act*. The various offences of stealing such as section 54 ‘Stealing Domestic Animals’ are generally covered by the Property Offences provisions contained in Part 7 of the Criminal Code.

(ii) Relevance

Some of these public order offences have their beginnings as far back as Henry VIII’s Act relating to Vagabonds of 1536³, and the *Tumultuous Petitioning Act 1661*.

Many of them seem now to have little relevance to contemporary society, for example “driving or propelling any wagon, cart, dray or coach or on any other carriage or vehicle whatsoever”⁴ or “engages in any prize fight”⁵ or “leaves his wife or child chargeable, or ... without any means of support other than public charity”,⁶ or “makes any cellar, or any opening, door or window in or beneath the surface of the footpath of any street or public place”⁷.

References to “canal, navigable stream, dock or basin.” and “wanders abroad”⁸ do not really sit well in the Northern Territory.

These provisions, if still useful, should be rewritten in contemporary language, but if outdated and irrelevant, should be repealed.

(iii) Status Offences

Some offences are ‘status’ offences, punishing people for who they are and not for what their conduct is on a particular occasion.

An example of this is “being a suspected person or reputed thief,” and being near various waterways such as canals, or any street⁹. This type of provision is traceable back to the Elizabethan Vagrancy Acts of 1597¹⁰ which were used to control the poorer and ‘dangerous’ classes¹¹ and later during the enclosures, to force the unattached and unemployed to work in the new factories during the Mercantile and Industrial Revolutions¹².

‘Status’ offences are contrary to the principle that people should only be punished for what they do, not for who they are or what category they fit in to, and are generally not appropriate or acceptable today. The laws against begging and some loitering offences might be seen in this light.

2 s.56(1)(e)

3 27 Hen. 8, c. 25 (1536)

4 s.75(1)(d)(iv)

5 s.55(1)

6 s.57(1)(p) This offence dates back to the Poor Laws in the 16th Century. The *Family Law Act*, and the *Care and Protection of Children Act* have overtaken this provision.

7 s.89

8 s.57

9 s.57(1)(l)

10 39 Eliz., chapter 4 (1597) which dealt with the whipping of rogues and vagabonds, and the persecution of “outlandish people calling themselves Egyptians”, among other things.

11 L Radzinowicz *A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750* vol 4 (1968) 1-42

12 See William Chambliss (1964) ‘A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy’ *Social Problems*, Summer, 67-77

(iv) Consistency with criminal law principles

Sometimes the provisions are inconsistent with legal principles of criminal responsibility.

For example section 57(5) says to prove intent for that offence:

“it shall not be necessary to show that the person charged was guilty of any particular act or acts tending to show his intent, but he may be found guilty from the circumstances of the case and from his known character as proved to the Court”.

This flies in the face of general principles of criminal law. Nowadays you cannot be held responsible for intending to do something merely by proof of your “known character as proved to the court”¹³. One assumes that proof of someone’s known character would be by Police telling the court of the person’s prior convictions and the tendering of his antecedent criminal history. With a few exceptions that cannot happen today¹⁴.

A suspicion that a person may be about to commit an offence because he has committed similar ones before is not enough¹⁵. The law of attempts, incitement and conspiracy cover those acts not yet committed that have the potential for harm.

(v) Burden of Proof

Generally in criminal law the burden of proof rests on the state to prove the offence beyond reasonable doubt and no burden rests on the accused¹⁶ and an accused has a ‘privilege against self incrimination’ and the associated right of silence. It is now however becoming more common to reverse the onus with the advent of offences of strict liability and the often associated defence of ‘reasonable excuse’.

A number of provisions in the SOA have reversed the onus of proof, for example the offences of being in possession of deleterious drugs or housebreaking implements¹⁷, and being in possession of property reasonably believed to have been stolen¹⁸. The old offences of having no visible means of support have thankfully gone.

(vi) Frequency of usage

The fact that an offence is not often used does not of itself prove it is unnecessary. Nor conversely does the fact that one is often used, prove it is necessary, but the frequency of a provision’s use is a factor that should be considered.

(vii) More appropriate location elsewhere

The SOA covers a wide area and has some widely disparate provisions. Some provisions could be better placed in other Acts dealing with the same subject. For example the Liquor offences may be better placed in the *Liquor Act* and the trespass offences may be better placed in the *Trespass Act*.

¹³ Section 57(5)

¹⁴ Some exceptions to this are: the offence against loitering by a sexual offender, where the fact of being a sexual offender is proved by tendering certificates of conviction, and driving disqualified where similarly the fact of the drivers disqualification is proved.

¹⁵ As G Williams *Textbook of Criminal Law* (2nd ed 1983) 402 states: “So long as a crime lies merely in the mind it is not punishable, because criminal thoughts often occur to people without any serious intention of putting them into execution.”

¹⁶ *Nemo debet prodere se ipsum*, no-one should be obliged to produce evidence against themselves. As translated and discussed by Lord Diplock in *Sang* [1980] A.C. 402

¹⁷ Section 57(1)(e)

¹⁸ Section 61

Many offences in the SOA overlap with offences in the Criminal Code that deal with the same subject, for example offences of property damage¹⁹, and offences of violence²⁰ occur in both Acts. It must be decided if it is appropriate to keep separate but overlapping offences or whether to repeal one or the other.

(viii) Penalties – general principles

Punishment means the infliction by the state of consequences normally considered unpleasant, on a person in response to his or her having been convicted of a crime.²¹ The traditional justifications for punishment are (general and specific) deterrence, retribution or revenge, incapacitation, and rehabilitation.²² The varying amounts of punishment meted out to different types of aberrant behaviour shows the gravity with which that particular behaviour is regarded. This of course changes with time and place, and behaviour criminalised at some points in time or in some places, passes without comment or disapproval at others.²³ Conversely behaviour once regarded as acceptable might now be criminalised.²⁴

The worse society regards an offence the more severe one would expect the punishment should be. This is not always the case, however, and there are of course inconsistencies. It is difficult to compare, for example, the level of criminality of property crimes with the level of criminality of crimes against the person.

The punishment listed for each offence in the SOA is a maximum penalty, reserved for the very worst example of that type of behaviour. The very worst example is only ever approached, never actually reached, so the actual punishment received for an offence is rarely the maximum prescribed. The court will punish an offender, paying due regard to the maximum penalty, while bearing in mind the objective circumstances of the particular offence and the subjective circumstances of the particular offender. No two offences or offenders are identical,²⁵ and such things as antecedents, prospects of rehabilitation, overall criminality and public interest dictate what the punishment will be.

Discounts on sentences are generally given for pleas of guilty. Community work orders, fines, home detention and suspended sentences are alternatives to imprisonment, although some of these options are less available in areas outside the main population centres in the NT.

All penalties in the NT are gradually being converted to be expressed in 'penalty units'. The NT has a formula under the *Interpretation Act* that matches the length of imprisonment with a particular monetary penalty expressed in 'penalty units'. This formula will be used in all penalty provisions including the offences in the SOA.

The maximum fine is worked out by multiplying 100 penalty units by the term of imprisonment expressed in years or a fraction of a year if the term is less than 12 months. Thus 12 months imprisonment is equivalent to 100 times the amount of the penalty unit, and six months is equivalent to 50 times the penalty unit.

From 1 July 2010 the value of a penalty unit will be \$133, so 6 months imprisonment is regarded as equivalent to a fine of \$6,650. The amount of the penalty unit will be adjusted on 1 July every year, according to the formula in the *Penalty Units Act*, which increases the value

19 Section 52 'Injuring or extinguishing Street Lamps'.

20 Section 55 'Challenge to Fight'.

21 Von Hirsch A. *Doing Justice : The choice of Punishments: Report of the Committee for the Study of Incarceration*. (1976) Hill & Wang, New York.

22 For discussions on whether any or all of these principles work please read widely.

23 For example, religious crimes, drinking in the prohibition/restricted area era, and homosexuality .

24 Examples abound, and include domestic violence, drink driving and laws regarding duelling.

25 "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds" Emerson.

of the penalty unit according to the Darwin CPI. Thus the actual fines will automatically keep pace with any annual inflation greater than approximately 1%.

(ix) Penalties – reviewed

The penalties in the offences have been reviewed. However, no firm view can be reached until positions are finalised concerning what offences are to be retained and, if so, the content of them. In general terms, penalties of imprisonment remain the same as exist currently. Fines penalties have been, as a general rule, adjusted as per the default formula contained in section 38DA of the *Interpretation Act*.

For proposed penalties for offences that go outside of these general observations, there is a more detailed explanation in the part of the paper that deals with the offence.

Other Options

City Council and Local Government by-laws cover a lot of public order offences. So also do the *Local Government Act*, the *Public Health Act*, the *Trespass Act*, the *Litter Act*, the *Nudity Act*, the *Places of Public Entertainment Act*, and the *Observance of the Law Act*. Sometimes these offences overlap or contain inconsistencies. The rules, regulations and laws about dogs are examples of this.

Some practitioners have suggested that offences in the above Acts be placed in the SOA, while others suggest the reverse, that various offences in the SOA should be placed in the other Acts.

Redrafting

Should the offences in some provisions be retained there will be a need to redraft them. This will be to ensure a contemporary form and consistency with the criminal responsibility provisions of Part IIAA of the Criminal Code.

Anachronisms such as references to ‘servants’ and ‘picklock, crow, jack bit or other implement of housebreaking’, should be removed or changed to a modern reference. Definitions and terminology should be standardised regarding ‘premises’ and ‘public place’, municipalities, shires and references to the Police force.

The terminology of the Act is invariably masculine and should where ever possible be gender neutral.

It should be noted in passing however that there is a great deal of opposition to making the provisions consistent with Part IIAA from both defence practitioners and Police. This is generally because of a perception by both parties that Part IIAA adds another level of complexity to otherwise simple legislation, is confusing and unnatural, and will make the legislation harder to understand. It is, however, Government Policy to make legislation Part IIAA compliant.

Comparisons with other Jurisdictions

Victoria, New South Wales, SA, Queensland and New Zealand have a SOA and Tasmania still has its *Police Offences Act*. Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory on the other hand, have repealed their summary offences Acts and placed the provisions they wished to keep into other Acts. The ACT includes most of its summary offences in its Crimes Act, as does WA in its Criminal Code.

The jurisdictions have however retained very different Acts. While there are some offences common to all, such as the offences of ‘Disorderly Behaviour’ and ‘loitering’ (however named), all jurisdictions have included a number of different offences in their respective Acts, and sometimes have very different provisions for the same or similar offences.

Some jurisdictions include offences in their summary offences legislation that the NT has placed in different Acts. For example SA includes ‘Assault Police’ in its *Summary Offences Act*, whereas the NT has the offence in the Criminal Code and also in the *Police Administration Act*.

Some jurisdictions have specific parts and sections. For example NZ and Queensland include a separate part for graffiti offences²⁶ in their summary offences legislation, whereas the NT has included an offence of graffiti among other offences including ‘bill posting’ in section 75(1)(g)²⁷.

Some jurisdictions have provisions in their summary offences legislation which do not exist at all in NT.

26 Queensland has *Summary Offences Act 2005 (QLD)* ss23A – 23E regarding selling paint cans and Part 3 ‘Removal of Public Graffiti’ sections 27 – 45 regarding the offence of Graffitiing and the appointment of State Graffiti Removal Officers. NZ has ss11A & 11B of *Summary Offences Act 1981*.

27 “writes upon, soils defaces or marks any building, wall or fences with chalk or paint...”

PUBLIC ORDER

*"I don't care what they do as long as they don't do it in the street and frighten the horses"*²⁸

'Public Order' is central to what the SOA is about. Public order offences are those offences, generally of a less serious nature, that relate to conduct in, enjoyment of, and passage through public and other places. The offences include 'disorderly behaviour', 'offensive behaviour', and 'loitering', and as well as criminalising certain behaviour, these offences give Police necessary powers to direct the public or individuals for the protection of the members of the public. The offences rely to a great extent on Police perception of a situation, their use of common sense and restraint, and ultimately their use of discretion in acting on that assessment.

The public order provisions are purposefully vague in order that the behaviour in question is subject to the discretion of the Police, and after that, the discretion of the courts. Strict enforcement is not desirable as situations differ from time to time and place to place and flexibility in interpretation is necessary. Behaviour that would constitute an offence in one situation may not in another. This of course leads to a certain amount of uncertainty but that is the price we pay for the flexibility we need from these laws.

In England the *Public Order Act 1986*, seemingly rather circuitously but in fact realistically, defines "offensive conduct" to mean "conduct the constable reasonably suspects to constitute an offence under this section."²⁹ The conduct in England also requires the presence of an actual victim. This is not always the case in other jurisdictions.

Public order policing extends from policing public protests and processions³⁰, through to policing unruly or offensive behaviour outside night clubs or pubs and places of recreation or entertainment. There is an obvious link between alcohol and public disorder, and research shows there is an over-representation of marginalised and disadvantaged groups including youths, the mentally ill, and indigenous people in public order offending³¹.

Public Order Offences also include the loitering offences, begging, busking, various violence offences, consorting, and offences regulating traffic and prohibiting nuisances in public spaces and thoroughfares.

There is a high volume of public order/public nuisance offences dealt with in the Courts with most being uncontested. The vast majority of offenders receive a fine and many are dealt with ex-parte. In the NT many of these offences are dealt with by infringement notices.

These offences are at the confluence of individual rights and public security. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said "each individual should have the maximum liberty consistent with the equal liberty of all other individuals." The State must balance the moral right of citizens to speak their minds in a non-provocative way on matters of public or political concern with the right of people to go about their business unmolested and unthreatened.

Public Order laws are where a citizen's liberty meets the power and authority of the State and particular care must be taken in those areas where this occurs.³² There are, and will continue

28 Comment attributed to a Mrs Patrick Campbell by Justice Kearney in *Pregelj v Manison* (1988) 31 A Crim R 383 @ 400.

29 Section 5(5) *Public Order Act 1986* (UK)

30 See for example the Queensland approach to protest in the 1970s.

31 Cunneen C. 2001, *Conflict, politics and crime: Aboriginal Communities and the Police*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney; Cunneen C. & White, R 2007, *Juvenile Justice: youth and crime in Australia*, 3rd edn, Oxford University Press, Melbourne; see also Luke, G & Cunneen, C, 1998, *Sentencing Aboriginal People in the Northern Territory: A statistical Analysis*, Northern Territory Aboriginal Legal Aid Service.

32 *Anderson v Attorney General (NSW)* (1987) 10 NSWLR 198; 27 A Crim R 103 @ 107 per Kirby J.

to be, many circumstances where the right to freedom of expression, or any other right for that matter, will not be in issue. There are other occasions where a person behaves in a noisy and annoying manner to the consternation of people using the footpath, park or any other public place, thereby disrupting the public order. The context in which the activity takes place must be considered in order that the countervailing interests may properly be weighed.³³

Brennan J explained the necessity for a balance in *Alister v The Queen*:³⁴

“It is of the essence of a free society that a balance is struck between the security that is desirable to protect society as a whole and the safeguards that are necessary to ensure individual liberty.”

Just because conduct is not ‘orderly’ does not mean that it is necessarily ‘disorderly’. The words are not precise antonyms. A concern here is that the commission of the offence may be just in the eye of the beholder. In some circumstances, for example, behaviour will not be disorderly because the disruption is relatively minor compared to the significance of the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, or some other right. The same behaviour, however, may be properly considered disorderly in the absence of the right, or some other right, being exercised.

The Public Order legislation is to serve “public, not private purposes”³⁵, and its objective is not the protection of individuals from emotional upset, but the protection of the public from disorder calculated to interfere with the public’s normal activities³⁶.

33 *R v Lohnes* [1992] 1 SCR 167

34 *Alister v The Queen* (1984) 154 CLR 404 @ 456

35 *Coleman v Power* (2004) 220 CLR 1; Gummow and Hayne JJ at para [179]. See also Gleeson CJ at para [32]; McHugh J at para [35]; Kirby J at para [224]; Callinan J at paras [296] – [297]; Heydon J at para [324].

36 *R v Lohnes* [1992] 1 SCR 167 @ para [22]

LANGUAGE

Research in NSW³⁷ and Queensland³⁸ has shown a major contributor to indigenous over-representation in Police custody is the offensive language provision. Indigenous people are disproportionately more likely to be arrested for this offence and the number of people brought to Court solely for using offensive language has been described in NSW as ‘most disturbing’³⁹. The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody considered there was a need to reduce the detention of Aboriginal people resulting from offensive language crimes in particular. They recommended⁴⁰ that:

- (a) The use of offensive language in circumstances of interventions initiated by Police should not normally be occasion for arrest or charge; and
- (b) Police services should examine and monitor the use of offensive language charges.

In the NT there have been 528 Obscene/indecent language⁴¹ charges in the last ten years and 833 charges of ‘Use objectionable words in a public place’⁴². These figures do not take account of a person’s Aboriginality so we can’t give an accurate portrayal of how much more the offence impacts on Indigenous than non-Indigenous people in the NT, but the Queensland and NSW research over the last few years suggests a similar situation of massive Indigenous over-representation would similarly occur here.

This is a contentious area with a history of controversy as a great many of these offences occur when the language is used against or towards Police. There is of course a public expectation that Police need to accept that being exposed to bad language is always going to be part of their job.

Police accept this, and even when the language is solely directed at Police research has shown that officers generally accept the abuse until and unless it interferes with the job⁴³. This is more likely when the behaviour is in public. In the normal course of events Police need respect for their authority to enable them to do their job in public space. Abuse directed at Police entails a lack of respect for that authority. When disrespect for the authority of Police is shown and especially where that disrespect is shown in public, the authority, necessary for Police to do their job, is lessened. The Police duty to protect the public and ensure public order then becomes much more difficult. Normal situations can become tense and tense situations can escalate. It is when the disrespect is shown in public that the arrests generally happen.

Police are trained in the exercise of discretion including in relation to public order incidents. They are not expected to enforce all the laws all of the time, but a challenge to Police authority can ensure a Police intervention that might not otherwise occur.

Some jurisdictions separate the offensive language provisions from the offensive behaviour provisions, and have a lesser penalty, generally only a fine, for the offensive language offences. Having the offences separate recognises the different level of criminality of the

37 ‘Race and Offensive Language Charges’ *Crime and Justice Statistics* NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research August 1999

38 *Policing Public Order; A Review of the Public Nuisance Offence* Crime and Misconduct Commission May 2008 Brisbane

39 Weatherburn D 1997 ‘Aboriginals and Public Order Legislation in NSW’ Media Release 28 May 1997. NSW Bureau of Crime and Statistics. [http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/mr_cjb34.pdf/\\$file/mr_cjb34.pdf#target=blank](http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/mr_cjb34.pdf/$file/mr_cjb34.pdf#target=blank) viewed 19 February 2010

40 Recommendation 86 *National Report: Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody* AGPS Canberra

41 Section 53(1)(a)(i)

42 Section 53(7)(a)

43 Queensland Crime and Misconduct Commission, *Policing Public Order: A Review of the Public Nuisance Offence*, May 2008

behaviour offence from the language offence and also enables better monitoring of the use of the charges.

The New Zealand, SA and the NSW behaviour and language provisions are separated, and in 2008 the Queensland Crime and Misconduct Commissions Report on the Queensland Public Nuisance Offence (section 6 *Summary Offences Act 2005*) recommended that there be a separate offence covering offensive language only.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT

The SOA can be broken down to seven different categories of behaviour. These are:

- (1) liquor related offences and powers (see page 17);
- (2) public order offences (see page 18);
- (3) loitering offences (see page 29)
- (4) noise provisions (see page 49);
- (5) trespass offences (see page 52);
- (6) dishonesty offences (see page 53);
- (7) indecency or obscenity offences (see page 60); and
- (8) miscellaneous offences (see page 64).

1. LIQUOR RELATED OFFENCES AND POWERS

Part VIA drinking in public places

Sections 45C – 45K

These provisions are used continually by NT Police and are relied on to regulate and control drinking in public space both in the cities and in rural areas. There is a procedure detailed in the section for special licensing and exemption certificates to cover special events.

Section 45D prohibits drinking liquor in a public place that is within two kilometres of licensed premises and the rest of Part VIA outlines the Police powers to enforce this ‘two kilometre rule’.

There have been only 11 prosecutions for this offence in the last ten years and these matters seldom go to Court. Police tend not to give out notices⁴⁴ to appear in Court under this section as the penalty for non-observance of the law is forfeiture of the seized alcohol which generally occurs anyway. The Police tip the liquor out at the scene or, if tipping it out would inflame a touchy situation they instead just confiscate it, remove it from the area and then destroy it. Nothing is generally done about the people drinking, and they are not charged with any offence unless a disturbance is created.

Since these offences were enacted other restrictions have evolved in the current *Liquor Act*, with still more since the recent introduction of the *Northern Territory National Emergency Response Act 2007(Cth)*, with new laws regarding Prescribed Areas and Restricted Areas, and new restrictions on liquor sale and consumption. The two kilometre rule is still generally regarded as necessary and after suitable updating, the whole of the ‘Drinking in Public Places’ section of Part VIA of the SOA, would be better placed in the *Liquor Act*. This could occur as part of the proposed re-write of the *Liquor Act* that is also under current development by the Department of Justice. These provisions have not been reviewed here as they will be reviewed as part of the aforementioned rewrite.

Recommendation for Part VIA

The whole of Part VIA of the SOA be placed in the proposed new legislation that will replace the *Liquor Act*.

⁴⁴ See section 45G

2. PUBLIC ORDER OFFENCES

Section 47 Offensive, &c., conduct

Every person who is guilty:

- (a) of any riotous, offensive, disorderly or indecent behaviour, or of fighting, or using obscene language, in or within the hearing or view of any person in any road, street, thoroughfare or public place;
- (b) of disturbing the public peace;
- (c) of any riotous, offensive, disorderly or indecent behaviour in any police station;
- (d) of offensive behaviour in or about a dwelling house, dressing-room, training-shed or clubhouse;
- (e) of unreasonably causing substantial annoyance to another person; or
- (f) of unreasonably disrupting the privacy of another person,

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

Offensive Behaviour

The words ‘Offensive Behaviour’ in this section are explained in *Wurramurra and Pregelj v Haymon*⁴⁵ by Asche J, and in its appeal; *Pregelj v Manison*; *Wurramurra v Manison*⁴⁶ by Nader, Kearney and Rice JJ.

The offending behaviour must be behaviour;

“such as is calculated to wound the feelings, arouse anger or resentment or disgust or outrage in the mind of a reasonable person”.⁴⁷

The actual intention that is proscribed however, is not to the intention to do the act but the intention to cause the offence or doing the act while foreseeing the possibility of causing offence. It is not necessary that anyone was actually offended by the behaviour, as long as the behaviour was of such a nature and the circumstances were such that a reasonable person would have been offended by the behaviour⁴⁸. To be guilty of offensive behaviour a person must both intend to engage in the behaviour and also be aware of the circumstances that make it offensive⁴⁹.

*“The gravamen of offensive behaviour is the offending of another person, and the offending must be intended. Behaviour that does not offend, at least potentially, cannot be offensive. Behaviour, offensive in other circumstances, committed in complete privacy cannot be offensive. It cannot be in the nature of any conduct to be offensive without including in the definition of the conduct the circumstances which render it offensive. Therefore, on one view of it, the offending of a person, actually or potentially, is an integral element of the prescribed conduct. On that view of it the “act” of the defendant includes the act of offending, for which he is excused from criminal responsibility unless the offending were intended or foreseen by him as a possible consequence of his conduct.”*⁵⁰

⁴⁵ (1987) 24 A Crim R 195, & (1987) 86 FLR 52

⁴⁶ (1988) 31 A Crim R 383, (1987) FLR 346 & 51 NTR 1

⁴⁷ *Worcester v Smith* (1951) VLR 316 approved in *Wurramurra and Pregelj v Haymon* (1987) 24 A Crim R 195

⁴⁸ *Ellis v Fingleton* (1972) 3 SASR 437

⁴⁹ *Pregelj v Manison* (1987) 51 NTR 1 (where an act of sexual intercourse taking place in a house which could be seen from the street was not offensive behaviour unless the defendant was aware that the act could in fact be observed)

⁵⁰ *Pregelj v Manison* (1987) 51 NTR 1 per Nader J

Disorderly Behaviour

The words ‘Disorderly Behaviour’ are explained in *Watson v Trennery* (1998) 122 NTR 1, where it was held that burning a flag during a peaceful demonstration was not ‘disorderly behaviour’.

“Disorderly behaviour’ is not a legal conception fixed by judicial decision, but rather is an ordinary and rudimentary expression (like “reasonable doubt”) which eludes a priori definition. It can be illustrated but not defined; it is to be applied to the circumstances of each case by the finder of fact”.

A generally accepted description of ‘disorderly behaviour’, (approved by the High Court in *Coleman v Power*⁵¹), is that of Turner J. in the NZ Court of Appeal in *Melser v Police* (1967) NZLR 437 at 444. The judgements in *Melser* emphasised the impact of the conduct on others present. In that case, Turner J said:

“Disorderly conduct is conduct which is disorderly; it is conduct which, while sufficiently ill-mannered, or in bad taste, to meet with the disapproval of well-conducted and reasonable men and women, is also something more – it must, in my opinion, tend to annoy or insult such persons as are faced with it – and sufficiently deeply or seriously to warrant the interference of the criminal law.”

Indecent Behaviour

‘Indecent behaviour’ is explained in *Romeyko v Samuels*⁵², a Full Court decision of the SA Supreme Court in 1971, as “offensive to the sexual modesty of the average person”.

It is again explained in *Prowse v Bartlett*⁵³, also a SA Supreme Court decision in 1972, as “behaviour that offends to a substantial degree recognised standards of propriety”.

The meaning of these terms: offensive, disorderly, and indecent, have of course changed through time and through the long life of the provisions. Gleeson CJ explained the changing nature of the terms in the High Court decision of *Coleman v Power*⁵⁴ in 2004:

“Concepts of what is disorderly, or indecent, or offensive, vary with time and place, and may be affected by the circumstances in which the relevant conduct occurs. The same is true of insulting behaviour or speech. In the context of legislation imposing criminal sanctions for breaches of public order, which potentially impairs freedom of speech and expression, it would be wrong to attribute to Parliament an intention that any words or conduct that could wound a person’s feelings should involve a criminal offence. At the same time, to return to an example given earlier, a group of thugs who, in a public place, threaten, abuse or insult a weak and vulnerable person may be unlikely to provoke any retaliation, but their conduct, nevertheless, may be of a kind that Parliament intended to prohibit. ([1967] NZLR 437 at 446)”.

It must be recognised that section 47 of the SOA requires great deal of discretion on the part of the Police Officer. He or she must be aware of the situation that exists at the time and the community standards that prevail at that time, in that situation, and in that place. There is a difference in the expected standards across the Territory and what is acceptable behaviour or language at one time and in one place may not be so in another. The behaviour that is acceptable outside the Vic at closing time may not be appropriate a few hours earlier and 200 metres away at the Eisteddfod in the Entertainment Centre. Justice Rice said in *Pregelj v Manison*:

51 (2004) 220 CLR 1

52 (1971) 2 S.A.S.R. 529

53 (1972) 3 S.A.S.R. 472

54 (2004) 220 CLR 1 @ 25

“In my opinion, it is important to bear steadily in mind the basic concept which surrounds human affairs, and that is, acceptable behavioural patterns are in no small measure influenced by time, place and circumstance.”⁵⁵

The original version of these offences in the *Vagrancy Act* (UK) proscribed using threatening, abusive or insulting words, and required an *intent* to provoke a breach of the peace.⁵⁶ This intention to provoke a breach of the peace was omitted from later versions of the offences in the late 1920s and early 1930s by various jurisdictions at the same time as the offence was widened to include riotous, disorderly, indecent, or offensive behaviour, and to include fighting. This behaviour might involve no threat of a breach of the peace but was regarded as contrary to good order.⁵⁷

There might however be no threat to a breach of the peace because the fear of vulnerable members of the public might prevent them reacting to the behaviour, or they might forbear reacting due to their greater self control, but it could still be behaviour that merited the intervention of the criminal law.

The old requirement of the offender having the intent to provoke a breach of the peace was removed from the NT legislation, but the requirement is still sometimes a feature of the legislation on the same topic in other jurisdictions.⁵⁸ Some jurisdictions still have a requirement relating to a likely breach of the peace, but that is also not required in the NT.

In New Zealand the offences of ‘disorderly behaviour’ and ‘offensive behaviour or language’ are now separated⁵⁹. Section 4 of the *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ), the ‘disorderly behaviour’ provision, makes liable to imprisonment or a fine anyone who:

“in or within view of any public place, behaves, or incite or encourages any person to behave, in a riotous, offensive, threatening, insulting, or disorderly manner that is likely in the circumstances to cause violence against persons or property to start or continue”.

Thus the proscribed behaviour requires a likelihood that it will lead to violence against persons or property.

NZ’s section 5, the ‘offensive behaviour or language’ provision however requires an intent to “threaten, alarm, insult or offend” the addressed person. This offence only carries a fine. Thus the more serious behaviour, section 4, that is likely to cause violence, carries imprisonment, and the less serious section 5 which, (including language), only threatens, alarms, insults or offends, carries only a fine.

New Zealand also has the offences of ‘Disorderly Behaviour on Private Premises’, and ‘Disorderly Assembly’, which are addressing the problem of gangs such as the mongrel mob.⁶⁰

The corresponding West Australian ‘disorderly behaviour’ provision is section 74A *Criminal Code 1913* (WA). The offence carries a \$6000 fine and does not carry imprisonment.⁶¹

⁵⁵ *Pregelj v Manison; Wurrumurra v Manison* (1988) 31 A Crim R 383, (1987) FLR 346 & 51 NTR 1

⁵⁶ If any legal expression is a work of art it is ‘breach of the peace’. Courts have refined the concept to establish that it is allied to harm, actual or prospective, against persons or property.

⁵⁷ See *Coleman v Power* (2004) 220 CLR per Gleeson CJ.

⁵⁸ See for example s. 59 of the *Police Act 1892* (WA), s.17 of the *Summary Offences Act* (Vic), s22 & 23 *Summary offences Act 1953* (SA); and s.12 *Police Offences Act 1935* (Tas)

⁵⁹ Sections 3 & 4 of the *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ)

⁶⁰ s.5 & s5A *Summary Offences Act* (NZ)

⁶¹ WA has also removed imprisonment as a penalty for stealing or receiving goods worth less than \$1000. See section 426(4) *Criminal Code* WA.

Section 74A – Disorderly behaviour in public

(1) *In this section –*

behave in a disorderly manner includes –

- (a) *to use insulting, offensive or threatening language; and*
- (b) *to behave in an insulting, offensive or threatening manner.*

(2) *A person who behaves in a disorderly manner –*

- (a) *in a public place or in the sight or hearing of any person who is in a public place; or*
- (b) *in a police station or lock-up,*

is guilty of an offence and is liable to a fine of \$6,000.

In WA in order to reduce prison numbers, there is now a policy of not allowing prison sentences of less than six months for minor offending. The offence of ‘Disorderly behaviour’ therefore does not provide imprisonment as an option but instead has a large maximum fine of \$6000. Other public order offences however do carry imprisonment. The offence of ‘Threatening Violence’ (section 74) carries 12 months, ‘Obscene acts in Public’ (section 202) carries 12 months, and ‘Indecent acts in public’ (section 203) carries nine months imprisonment.

SA has perhaps the most streamlined section.

Section 7 – Disorderly or offensive conduct or language

(1) *A person who, in a public place or a police station –*

- (a) *behaves in a disorderly or offensive manner; or*
- (b) *fights with another person; or*
- (c) *uses offensive language,*

is guilty of an offence.

In the SA Act, ‘disorderly’ behaviour is defined⁶² to include ‘riotous’ behaviour, and ‘offensive’ behaviour includes ‘threatening abusive or insulting’ behaviour. The offence carries three months imprisonment. ‘Indecent behaviour and gross indecency’ (section 23) also carries three months whereas the penalty for ‘indecent language’ (section 22) only carries a fine of up to \$250.

NSW has separated the offences of ‘offensive conduct’ and ‘offensive language’ and does not have a disorderly behaviour prohibition, (there is however section 11A ‘Violent Disorder’, which is the equivalent of the NT section 47AA.) The ‘offensive conduct’ provision provides that merely using offensive language does not qualify as ‘offensive conduct’.

In NSW ‘Offensive conduct’ (section 4 *Summary Offences Act 1988*) carries three months imprisonment whereas ‘Offensive language’ (section 4A) carries a fine or up to 100 hours of community service.

Queensland, after the decision of *Coleman v Power*⁶³ in which a conviction for using insulting words was set aside, repealed their old *Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Act 1931* (Qld)

⁶² Section 7(3)

⁶³ (2004) 220 CLR 1.

and introduced the *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld). This Act includes the offence of Public Nuisance (section 6)⁶⁴.

Section 6 – Public Nuisance

(1) *A person must not commit a public nuisance offence*

...

(2) *A person commits a public nuisance offence if –*

The person behaves in;

- (i) *a disorderly way; or*
- (ii) *an offensive way; or*
- (iii) *a threatening way; or*
- (iv) *a violent way; and*
- (b) *the person's behaviour interferes, or is likely to interfere, with the peaceful passage through, or enjoyment of, a public place by a member of the public.*

The offence carries six months imprisonment and or 10 Queensland penalty units (\$1,000). Behaving in an offensive way is said to include using offensive, obscene, indecent, or abusive language. Behaving in a threatening way includes using threatening language. A complaint from the public is not required before a Police officer can start proceedings. Thus the behaviour must not only be of a certain anti social type but it must also interfere or be likely to interfere with public enjoyment of a public space. This requirement of the likely interference of the public's enjoyment of public space reinforces the need for a potential victim to the offence and should be included in the new NT section dealing with this type of behaviour. It should not be a public nuisance if there is in fact no public to witness the nuisance.

Queensland now has the most recent version of this offence. The Queensland legislation has removed the offence of 'disturbing the public peace', and also removed any mention of Police stations, dwelling houses, dressing rooms, training sheds or clubhouses. There is also no reference to 'disrupting the privacy of another person'.

The omission of Police stations from the offence is another matter however and as a Police station is not a public place and a lot of nuisance behaviour occurs within a Police station, the new NT offence should have Police stations included.

The ACT has section 392 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT) 'Offensive Behaviour' which carries no imprisonment but has \$1000 fine. The offence does not include 'disorderly' behaviour.

Section 392 – Offensive behaviour

A person shall not in, near, or within the view or hearing of a person in, a public place behave in a riotous, indecent, offensive or insulting manner.

As has been shown there is a wide variety of ways the different Australasian jurisdictions have approached this behaviour.

⁶⁴ Section 6 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld) was introduced originally as section 7AA *Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Act 1931* (Qld) in 2003, taking effect from April 1 2004. Then when the Vagrants Act was repealed the offence was carried over in identical terms to section 6 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld)

BREAKDOWN OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY OFFENCE

Section 47(a)

This subsection has remained much the same since 1924 and describes a number of different types of behaviour which can be broken down to:

- (i) Riotous Behaviour
- (ii) Offensive Behaviour
- (iii) Disorderly Behaviour,
- (iv) Indecent Behaviour
- (v) Fighting, and
- (vi) Using obscene language,
in public.

- (i) Riotous Behaviour in a Public Place has been charged 61 times in the last ten years.

This offence is one of the summary offences that NAAJA would prefer to be left in the Act to allow for the charging of behaviour that is not of the quality or seriousness of 'Violent Disorder' (section 47 AA).

- (ii) Offensive Behaviour in a Public Place has been charged 488 times in the last years.

- (iii) 'Disorderly Behaviour in view of the Public' has been charged 289 times. 'Disorderly Behaviour in Public Place' has been charged 3615 times. This anomaly is explained either by the behaviour occurring on private premises but being in view of the public, or by Police using different wording in the charge while describing the same behaviour. With a total of 3904 charges in the last ten years, and covering a wide variety of behaviour this is the most used part of this section.

- (iv) 'Behaving in an Indecent Manner in a Public Place' has been charged 100 times in the last ten years. This is often the offence of urinating in public. Some jurisdictions have a separate offence of urinating in public.

- (v) Fighting in a public place has been charged 280 times in the last ten years.

- (vi) The figures show 'obscene language' has not been charged in the last ten years under this subsection but has been charged instead under section 53(1)(a)(i) for total of 527 times.

Thus 47(a) has been used a total of 4833 times in the last ten years. Police generally charge either 'disorderly behaviour' or 'offensive behaviour' when using the section, as most of the proscribed behaviour can fit under one or other of these two headings. Most of the behaviour that has been charged under the other headings could probably also have been charged as either 'disorderly' or 'offensive' behaviour. What the Police charge as 'Indecent behaviour', for example, can be charged as 'offensive behaviour' up to the point where the objective seriousness of the offending leads to it being charged as 'Gross indecency in Public'⁶⁵ in the Criminal Code. Riotous behaviour similarly could be charged as 'disorderly behaviour' up to the point where the objective seriousness of the behaviour leads it to being charged as

⁶⁵ Section 133 NTCC

'Violent disorder'⁶⁶, Unlawful Assembly⁶⁷ or Riot.⁶⁸ Fighting in public can similarly be charged as 'disorderly behaviour'.

The Queensland section, has a requirement that the behaviour:

"interferes, or is likely to interfere, with the peaceful passage through, or enjoyment of, a public place by a member of the public",

Apart from the obvious requirement this subsection brings that there must be a victim or potential victim of the behaviour, this also broadens the provision to include the situation of behaviour being within the hearing or view of the public, but not in a public place, and so would cover the offences, that occur for example on private land, or in a bus or the back of a Police car, that should be included but would otherwise be missed.

Section 47(b)

Disturbing the peace does not envisage 'the peace' as in 'peace and quiet' or tranquillity.

The term 'disturbing the peace' is not defined in the SOA or the Criminal Code but case law has defined a breach/disturbance of the peace as:

- (i) whenever harm is done or likely to be done to a person
- (ii) whenever harm is done or likely to be done to property in the presence of the owner
- (iii) whenever a person is in fear of being harmed through an assault, affray, riot or other disturbance.⁶⁹

'Disturbing the Public Peace' has been charged 52 times in the last ten years. The term is too imprecise to remain in the Act and as the behaviour the subsection is meant to control is covered by subsection (a), it is unnecessary.

Section 47(c)

'Disorderly Behaviour in a Police Station' has been charged 1120 times, 'Indecent Behaviour in a Police Station' has been charged 12 times and 'Offensive Behaviour in a Police Station' has been charged 62 times for a total of 1194 charges in the last ten years.

The offences in section 47 should be rewritten to include being in or within the view of a public place or a Police station, to avoid having to have a separate offence for offensive or disorderly behaviour which occurs in a Police station.

Section 47(d)

'Behave Offensively in a Dwelling House' has been charged 157 times in the last ten years. This covers offensive behaviour that would otherwise be missed as a 'dwelling house' is not a public place. The words 'dressing room, training shed or clubhouse' have not been used in the last ten years and are superfluous. As the behaviour in this section happens in a Dwelling House and not in public, it is not a Public Order offence.

66 Section 47AA *Summary Offences Act*

67 Section 63 NTCC

68 Section 66 NTCC

69 *Parkin v Norman* [1983] QB 92; [1982] 3 WLR 523; [1982] 3 All ER 583; *R v Chief Constable of Devon & Cornwall; Ex parte Central Electricity Generating Board* [1982] QB 548; [1981] 3 WLR 967; [1981] 3 All ER 826 at 832–833 (All ER).

Section 47(e)

'Unreasonably Cause Substantial Annoyance' has been charged 253 times in the last ten years. Some people question if this should still be an offence in a democracy, even with the 'unreasonably' as a precursor. Being unreasonable or very annoying should not be a criminal offence. There was disquiet and ridicule in NSW during the recent visit of the Pope for World Youth Day when being annoying was briefly made criminal behaviour. That provision was swiftly repealed.

Section 47(f)

'Unreasonably Disrupt Privacy' has been charged 32 times in the last ten years. This is the 'Peeping Tom' offence and this behaviour is not properly covered by the other section 47 offences. Disrupting privacy is still a serious matter and should be dealt with separately with a 'Peeping Tom' provision.

Penalty for section 47

The offences in section 47 carry \$2000 and six months imprisonment. As can be seen from the above discussion the punishment for this offence varies between the jurisdictions and ranges from just a fine to six months imprisonment.

Western Australia,⁷⁰ and the ACT⁷¹ prescribe only a fine. NSW⁷² and NZ⁷³ have no imprisonment and only a fine for the language component of the offence, but three months imprisonment for the behaviour. SA,⁷⁴ provides for 3 months imprisonment for behaviour and language. Victoria⁷⁵ has only a fine for disorderly conduct, but up to six months (for a third offence) imprisonment for 'obscene, indecent or threatening' language or behaviour⁷⁶. Queensland⁷⁷ and the NT prescribe six months.

The NT is thus shown to be at the heavier end of punishment for this offence. As has been pointed out in discussions with NAAJA and members of the NT defence bar, the offence impacts mainly on indigenous people. Although actual imprisonment is not often given for this offence, it affects indigenous offenders disproportionately in other extended areas. For example where suspended sentences are breached by section 47, which at present is an offence carrying a term of imprisonment, the fact that section 47 itself carries a term of imprisonment increases the gravity of the breach and can lead to reimposition of the outstanding suspended sentence. It would seem that if the term of imprisonment were removed from the offence it would go some way towards lessening the appalling imprisonment rates for indigenous offenders.

There is often the unfortunate situation where an initial apprehension for disorderly behaviour or offensive language lead to an altercation with arresting Police and consequent charges of 'resist Police' and then 'assault Police'. The vast majority of these offences are caused when alcohol is involved. A lessening of the criminality of the initial triggering offence of 'disorderly behaviour' or 'offensive language' would lead to less confrontation and consequently less escalation of the situation and the consequent further serious charges. This is especially so in the very common situations of offenders directing bad language at Police, generally in situations where alcohol is involved, and the situation deteriorating rapidly to a confrontation

70 Section 74A *Criminal Code Compilation Act 1913* (WA)

71 Section 392 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT)

72 Sections 4 & 4A *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NSW)

73 Sections 3 & 4 *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ)

74 Section 7 *Summary Offences Act 1953* (SA)

75 Section 17A *Summary Offences Act 1966* (Vic)

76 Section 17 *Summary Offences Act 1966* (Vic)

77 Section 6 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld)

with Police. Police, without any malice, call these three charges when committed together “the trifecta” and call the two charges of disorderly behaviour and assault Police when committed together “the Quinella”.

The more extreme or serious examples of this offence are almost always accompanied by other more serious offences carrying heavier penalties, and this offence tends to be either subsumed in the other offences and becoming part of an aggregate sentence, or this particular charge gets dropped as being duplicitous.

The separation of the behaviour aspect from the language aspect in the offence would offer the opportunity for a lesser penalty where there is no violence threatened and the offence is caused solely by the language used. In a society such as the Northern Territory, unless violence is involved or implied, an offence that consists only of language should not carry imprisonment.

In the NT in 2009 of 317 people convicted of section 47 offences only 51 people (16%) spent time in gaol with the median time being less than a month. The majority (217) were given fines.

It is recommended the maximum penalty for the disorderly behaviours should be more in line with the other jurisdictions at three months (with the maximum fine being 25 penalty units as per section 38DA of the *Interpretation Act*).

THE FAULT ELEMENT OF THE OFFENCE

In *Pregelj v Manison* Nader J. said, regarding a couple charged with ‘offensive behaviour’:

“By virtue of s 31 of the NT Code, the appellants would not be criminally responsible for that event unless they intended it or relevantly foresaw it. “Intended” in this context means, not that they desired it to happen, but that they did the act with knowledge, in its wide sense, that offence to someone would be an actual or possible consequence.”

Guilt then is established by either the defendant having the intent to offend by the conduct, or foreseeing the causing of offence as a possible consequence of the conduct.

Recommendations for section 47

1. ‘Disturbing the public peace’, ‘unreasonably cause substantial annoyance’, ‘unreasonably disrupt the privacy of another person’, and fighting should be removed from the section.
2. The offence should include behaviour in a Police station as well as in a public place.
3. The offence should have ‘recklessness’ as the fault standard.
4. The offence should include a similar requirement to Queensland’s requirement of the behaviour interfering with the public’s enjoyment of public space.⁷⁸
5. The provision should follow the NSW and NZ structure of separating the language provisions from the behaviour provisions.
6. The language offence should not carry imprisonment.
7. The behaviour offence should carry a maximum penalty of 3 months.
8. There should be a separate ‘Peeping Tom’ offence.

⁷⁸ Section (6)(b) ‘the person’s behaviour interferes, or is likely to interfere, with the peaceful passage through, or enjoyment of, a public place by a member of the public’.

Section 47AA – Violent Disorder

(1) *A person is guilty of an offence if:*

- (a) *the person is one of two or more people engaging in conduct that involves a violent act; and*
- (b) *the conduct would result in anyone who is in the vicinity and of reasonable firmness fearing for his or her safety; and*
- (c) *the person:*
- (d) *intends or knows that the conduct involves a violent act and would have the result mentioned in paragraph (b); or*
- (e) *is reckless as to whether the conduct involves a violent act and would have that result.*

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months.

(2) *To avoid doubt:*

- (a) *to establish the offence, it is unnecessary to prove that each of the two or more people individually engaged in conduct that involves a violent act and would have the result mentioned in subsection (1)(b); and*
- (b) *no person of reasonable firmness need actually be, or be likely to be, present in the vicinity for the offence to be committed; and*
- (c) *the offence may be committed in private or public places; and*
- (d) *subsection (1)(c) does not affect the determination of the number of people mentioned in subsection (1)(a).*

(3) *The offence is an offence to which Part IIAA of the Criminal Code applies.*

Note for subsection (3)

Part IIAA of the Criminal Code states the general principles of criminal responsibility (including burdens of proof and general defences) and defines terms used for offences, for example, “conduct”, “intention” and “recklessness”.

(4) *In this section:*

conduct that involves a violent act includes:

- (a) *conduct capable of causing injury to a person or damage to property (whether or not it actually causes such injury or damage); and*
- (b) *a threat to engage in such conduct.*

This offence originally was the offence of ‘Affray’. The offence in its present form was enacted in 2006 in response to the disorders in Yuendumu and Wadeye. It was written as part of the 2006 Anti Gangs legislation so as to be compliant with Part IIAA of the Criminal Code. It has proved itself to be a useful provision covering much violent group activity that is less serious than a riot or serious assaults.

The offence requires that:

- (a) *the person is one of two or more people engaging in conduct that involves a violent act.*

Some other jurisdictions require more people to be engaged for example NSW has section 11A 'Violent Disorder' requiring three or more people. Similarly Queensland has section 10A 'Unlawful Assembly', again requiring three or more people.

The NT provision requires 'recklessness' as the mental or fault element. Other jurisdictions such as Queensland require knowledge, and SA requires intent. Thus the NT has a lower level (ie easier to prove) fault element than the other jurisdictions.

The offence when it was 'affray' or 'fight in a public place' was charged 424 times over nine years. Since it became 'Engage in Violent Conduct/Disorder' it has been charged 332 times in three years.

NAAJA submit the penalty for the offence of 12 months is too harsh a penalty for an offence that seldom causes any actual injury.

Penalty for section 47A

The SA provision carries 2 years imprisonment.⁷⁹ The NSW provision carries six months.⁸⁰ It is recommended the NT provision remain at 12 months (with maximum fine being 100 penalty units).

Recommendation for section 47A

This provision and the 12 months maximum penalty should be retained.

Section 47AB – Threatening Violence

A person who:

(a) *with intent to intimidate or annoy a person, threatens to damage a dwelling-house; or is guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months or, where the offence is committed at night-time, two years.

When initially enacted the offence was meant to address threatening to damage more things than just the dwelling house. It does not make grammatical sense in its present form and if the offence were to remain either the word 'or' should be removed, or perhaps there should be other things added to the things threatened.

The offence is listed in IJIS as "Alarm Person in Dwelling House" or "Threaten Damage to a Dwelling House".

The offence has been charged 42 times in ten years. The offence of 'Threats' section 200 Criminal Code also covers this conduct. It appears that section 47AB is unnecessary.

Recommendation for section 47AB

Section 47AB should be repealed.

⁷⁹ Section 6A *Summary Offences Act 1953* (SA)

⁸⁰ Section 11A *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NSW)

3. LOITERING OFFENCES

Included among the Public Order Offences are the offences dealing with loitering. The loitering offences are mainly preventative offences relying on Police observations and analysis of a person's conduct, coupled with the Police use of discretion. The Police, when anticipating an offence of any kind or a breach of the peace, have the power to request people to move away from a place in order to prevent an offence or breach of peace⁸¹ from occurring. If the person does not move away they then commit an offence by not complying with the request. The offence is not the initial loitering but continuing to do so.

The offence does not necessarily require a complaint from the public. It may pre-empt another actual offence or attempted offence. If the offence of 'loitering' did not exist then the Police might have to wait for another actual offence endangering people or property to occur before they could do anything. It is better for all concerned to prevent an offence from occurring than punish an offence after it has happened.

The English jurist Blackstone said:

*"...preventative justice is upon every principle, of reason, of humanity and of sound policy, preferable in all respects to justice; the execution of which, though necessary, and in its consequences a species of mercy to the Commonwealth, is always attended with many harsh and disagreeable circumstances."*⁸²

The Privy Council considered the meaning of loitering in *Attorney-General of Hong Kong v Sham Chuen* [1986] 1 AC 887:

*"Obviously a person may loiter for a great variety of reasons, some entirely innocent and others not so. It would be unreasonable to construe the subsection to the effect that there might be subjected to questioning persons loitering for plainly inoffensive purposes, such as a tourist admiring the surrounding architecture. The subsection impliedly authorises the putting of questions to the loiterer, whether by a Police officer or by any ordinary citizen. The putting of questions is intrusive, and the legislation cannot be taken to have contemplated that this would be done in the absence of some circumstances which make it appropriate in the interests of public order. So their Lordships conclude that the loitering aimed at by the subsection is loitering in circumstances which reasonably suggest that its purpose is other than innocent."*⁸³

The more modern and more enlightened loitering provisions allow a Police officer, who believes the loitering to be in circumstances that suggest an offence would be committed, to request the loitering person to move and so prevent an offence or an attempt at an offence. The offence is not the suspicious behaviour as perceived by the Police, but the failure to obey the Police direction to move on. This contrasts with some jurisdictions such as New Zealand and Victoria where the suspicious behaviour itself can be enough to make out the offence.

The words "cease to loiter" however, may not be understood by many offenders and the legislation should be worded so that Police can always use words that will be understood. The terminology in the offence perhaps should be changed to reflect that the person is to 'move on' rather than 'cease to loiter' and should in fact use that phrase.

Victoria has section 6. "Direction by Police to move on" which does the same job as the other jurisdictions loitering provisions. The addition of subsection (5) in the Victorian provision provides a safeguard for the democratic rights of protest:

81 A legal term of art.

82 Chapter 18 of book IV

83 @ 896. See also *Wynne v Lockyer* [1978] V.R. 279; *Samuel v Stokes* (1973) 130 CLR 490; *Power v Huffa* (1976) 14 SASR 337; *Rice v Daire* (1982) 30 SASR 560

- (5) *This section does not apply in relation to a person who, whether in the company of other persons or not, is –*
- (e) *picketing a place of employment; or*
 - (f) *demonstrating or protesting about a particular issue; or*
 - (g) *speaking, bearing or otherwise identifying with a banner, placard; or sign or otherwise behaving in a way that is apparently intended to publicise the person’s view about a particular issue.*

This safeguards political or industrial protest which should be protected in a democracy.

Section 47AC – Loitering By Sexual Offender

(1) *In this section, **sexual offence** means:*

- (a) *an offence against Division 2 of Part V of the Criminal Code;*
- (b) *an offence against sections 188(2)(k), 192, 192B or 201 of the Criminal Code;*
- (c) *an offence of:*
 - (i) *counselling or procuring;*
 - (ii) *aiding or abetting the commission of;*
 - (iii) *conspiring to commit;*
 - (iv) *attempting to commit; or*
 - (v) *being an accessory after the fact to,*
such an offence.

(2) *A person who:*

- (a) *has been found guilty of:*
 - (i) *a sexual offence;*
 - (ii) *murder where there are reasonable grounds to believe that a sexual offence was also committed on the victim; or*
 - (iii) *an offence against section 50⁸⁴; and*
- (b) *is found, without reasonable excuse, idling or lingering about in or near:*
 - (ii) *a school, kindergarten or child care centre; or*
 - (iii) *a public place regularly frequented by children and in which children are present at the time of the loitering,*
is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$5,000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

- (3) *If a person has at any time been convicted of an offence against a law of a State or another Territory of the Commonwealth which creates an offence substantially similar to a sexual offence, the conviction for the offence against that law shall be taken for the purposes of this section to be a conviction of a sexual offence.*

This is in fact a ‘status offence’ and is intended to be such. The status of the person being the fact that the person has been convicted of a sexual offence.

In *DPP v Field* [2001] VSC 472, it was held it is not necessary to prove the intention of committing a further sexual offence. Other loitering offences require ‘intent’ whereas this

⁸⁴ ‘Indecent exposure’ s.50 *Summary Offences Act*

offence is made out if the defendant (having the requisite prior offence or offences) is found “without reasonable excuse, idling or lingering about in or near...” This reverses the onus and the person has to have a reasonable excuse to be where he is.

It has been suggested that this offence has been overtaken by the new Child Sex Offenders Legislation the *Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Registration) Act*, but although that Act prohibits child related employment and demands registration of “sexual offenders” among other things, it does not necessarily prohibit ‘idling or lingering’ around a school or similar place.

There have been nine prosecutions for this offence since 2000. NSW and Tasmania have similar provisions⁸⁵ carrying up to 2 years imprisonment.

The maximum fine (of \$5,000) is less than the default penalty level of 100 penalty units provided for in the *Interpretation Act*. There appears to be no good reason for this variance.

Recommendation for section 47AC

This provision should be retained. The maximum penalty should remain at 12 months but the maximum fine of \$5000 should be removed from the offence so that the default fine level of 100 penalty units in section 38DA of the *Interpretation Act* applies.

Section 47A – Loitering General Offence:

(1) *A person loitering in any public place who does not give a satisfactory account of himself when requested so to do by a member of the Police Force shall, on request by a member of the Police Force to cease loitering, cease so to loiter.*

Penalty: \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

(2) *Where a person is loitering in a public place and a member of the Police Force believes, on reasonable grounds:*

(a) that an offence has been or is likely to be committed; or

(b) that the movement of pedestrian or vehicular traffic is obstructed or is about to be obstructed,

by that person or by any other person loitering in the vicinity of that person;

(c) that the safety of the person or any person in his vicinity is in danger; or

(d) that the person is interfering with the reasonable enjoyment of other persons using the public place for the purpose or purposes for which it was intended,

the member of the Police Force may require any person so loitering to cease loitering and to remove from that public place any article under his control, and a person so required shall comply with and shall not contravene the requirement.

Penalty: \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

47A(1) has been charged nine times and 47A(2) has been charged 174 times.

47A(1) is needlessly intrusive and is an example of a ‘status offence’. It allows the Police, without the requirement to give a reason, to ask anybody they don’t like the look of, to give a ‘satisfactory account of themselves’. This is a hangover from the Poor Laws and the *Vagrancy Act*. It is open to the abuse and victimisation of people according to who they are and what

⁸⁵ Section 11G *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NSW) & section 7A *Police Offences Act 1935* (Tas)

they look like rather than what they are doing. It can be used unfairly particularly regarding Indigenous people in towns.

Subsection 47A(2) on the other hand requires that a member of the Police 'believes on reasonable grounds' that an offence has been or is likely to be committed, an obstruction is being caused, or that something is happening or about to happen that needs the intervention of the Police. This construction is much more reasonable than the status offence of section 47A(1).

The section requires that the Police officer 'believes on reasonable grounds' that an offence has been or is likely to have been committed. This is a high standard and places much evidentiary responsibility on the Police for what is a preventative provision. It would be preferable to have 'reasonably suspects' as the mental standard required from the Police before they request someone to move on. 'Suspects' is a lower standard of conviction than 'belief'. 'Belief' requires an element of certainty which would be unrealistic and unnecessary for the way the offence is used. The offence as it used to be expressed is "fail to cease to loiter", meaning there is no offence if the person moves on. The provision is used more as a preventative power than a criminal offence and the higher mental standard of conviction required from the Police officer to 'believe' that a criminal offence has been or is likely to be committed tends to make the power too technical and difficult to justify. It is a discretionary and preventive power that should not be made too hard to use.

The offences in the other jurisdictions have developed quite differently from each other although displaying the same roots. Tasmania⁸⁶ has a similar section carrying 6 months imprisonment. Victoria's 'Loitering with intent' by a 'reputed thief' or convicted drug offender (section 49B) carries 2 years, while disobeying the direction by police to move on' (section 6) carries a fine. South Australia's 'Order to move on or disperse' (section 18) carries 3 months. New Zealand has an intent based provision⁸⁷ carrying a fine with imprisonment for three months for a second offence.

Recommendations for section 47A

1. Subsection 47A(1) should be repealed and subsection 47A(2) should remain.
2. The Police when enforcing the provision should not be required to use the word "loiter", rather they should use expressions such as "move away" or "move along".
3. 'Reasonably suspects' should replace 'believes on reasonable grounds'.
4. There should be a provision similar to section 6(5) of the Victorian *Summary Offences Act* which safeguards Political or Industrial action. (see above p29)
5. The fault element should be intent.
6. The maximum penalty should remain at 6 months with the default maximum monetary penalty of 50 penalty units to apply.

Section 47B – Loitering – Offence Following Notice

(1) *A police officer may give a written notice to a person who is loitering at a public place:*

- (a) *requiring the person to stay away from the place or an area including the place for a specified period not exceed 72 hours from the time the notice is given; and*
- (b) *specifying the place or area, and the period, as is reasonable in the circumstances;*
and

⁸⁶ Section 7 *Police Offences Act 1935* (Tas)

⁸⁷ Section 28 *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ) 'Being found in public place preparing to commit crime'

- (c) *specifying the consequences of contravening the notice.*
- (2) *The officer may do so only if the officer reasonably suspects:*
- (a) *the person has committed, or is about to commit, an offence at the place or in the area; or*
- (b) *the person is part of a group of people at the place and one or more people in the group have committed or are about to commit an offence at the place or in the area.*
- (4) *The person is guilty of an offence if:*
- (d) *the officer gives the person the notice; and*
- (e) *the person contravenes the notice.*

Maximum penalty: 100 penalty units or imprisonment for six months.

- (5) *It is a defence for an offence against subsection (4) if the defendant proves that the defendant has a reasonable excuse.*
- (6) *The officer must ensure all reasonable steps are taken to explain to the person (in language the person can readily understand) the matters mentioned in subsection (1)(a) to (c).*
- (7) *The notice is not invalidated by a failure to comply with subsection (6).*

This legislation has been described as ‘hot spots’ legislation which indicates the sort of problem it was introduced to address.

There were 12 prosecutions for this offence in 2007 and ten since. It was enacted in 2006. The Police initially complained that the legislation was too hard to implement, placed too many restrictions and demands on them, and was not having the effect that was intended.⁸⁸

Police were having difficulties with the application of this section in the places for which it was designed, such as Mitchell St. on a Friday or Saturday night. The issuing of a notice was felt to be impractical where there is a large group of people, and the Police suggested the section could be amended to provide for a verbal notice to be issued which would be formally recorded as soon as possible back at the station.

If however a verbal notice was all that is required it would seem that a time of 72 hours to stay away from the place is excessive and perhaps 12 hours would be more appropriate. This addresses the time at which the behaviour is a problem, say from midnight till 4 o'clock in the morning, and would keep the person away till the next afternoon, when the circumstances will have changed. This is more reasonable. A verbal warning to stay away for three days seems to be too much. The shorter time allows for the Police officer to monitor compliance for the duration of his or her shift, and to pass on information to those Police on the following shift.

Police have recently been issued with new ‘loitering notice’ forms to use while patrolling those particular beats and the system is being re-trialed with initial reports of success.

The *Liquor Legislation Amendment Act 2010* has recently been passed which addresses these problems in a different way, by introducing a system of designated areas (such as Mitchell St) from which people can be banned for periods of 48 hours by police and up to a year by a Court for persistent troublemakers. This will most likely lead to a lessening of importance for this provision.

The offence has been charged 22 times in the last three years.

88 See the second reading speech by Dr Toyne on 22/08/06

NAAJA says there have been complaints from young people about the use of these Police powers. NAAJA also suggests an on the spot fine would be appropriate. The Law Society is concerned at the extent of the powers.

The maximum fine for this offence is 100 penalty units. This is greater than the default level that would otherwise apply because of the operation of section 38DA of the *Interpretation Act*.

Recommendation for section 47B

1. This provision should be retained and monitored.
2. The maximum penalty should remain at 6 months and the default monetary penalty of 50 penalty units should apply.

Section 55 – Challenge to Fight

- (1) *Any person who sends or accepts, either by word or letter, any challenge to fight for money, or engages in any prize fight, shall be liable to a penalty of \$500, or to imprisonment, for any period not exceeding three months, or both.*
- (2) *The Justice before whom any person is found guilty of an offence against this section may, if he thinks fit, in addition to imposing a penalty, also require that person to find sureties for keeping the peace.*

There have been 49 prosecutions for this offence since 2000 which suggests it is useful provision. Recently there has been a reported growth in challenge fights or ‘grudge fights’ between juveniles with resultant unsavory U Tube clips being broadcast.

This is an old offence initially enacted to stop ‘prize fighting’⁸⁹. Section 70 of the Criminal Code “Challenge to Fight Likely to Cause Death or Serious Harm” would cover the more serious examples of this offence. NT does not have a Boxing Act regulating or forbidding unlicensed or unregistered fighting, or regulating, promoting or arranging the same. The reference to money should be removed and the offence should simply be to challenge to fight. Additionally, the monetary penalty should be increased from \$500 to at least the default penalty of 25 penalty units. There is also a case for arguing that the monetary penalty should be significantly greater than 25 penalty units given that, for organised fights, the motivation for the fight is a profit or economic motivation. For such cases the penalty should be a monetary one designed to attack the potential profits.

Subsection (2) is unnecessary as a Magistrate has the power to bind someone over to keep the peace on a ‘good behaviour order’ in any case.

Western Australia has a similar provision carrying a fine in the summary jurisdiction.

Recommendation for section 55

Section 55 should amended to remove the reference to money and the maximum penalty of three months should be retained but with consideration to be given to increasing the maximum penalty so that it provides an appropriate deterrent to organised prize fights.

⁸⁹ Prize fighting is discussed in *Pallante v Stadiums Pty Ltd (no. 1)* [1976] VR 331 per McInerney J.

Section 55A – Consorting Between Known Offenders

(1) *A person is guilty of an offence if:*

(a) *the Commissioner gives a written notice to the person under this section prohibiting the person, for a specified period not exceeding 12 months, from one or both of the following as specified in the notice:*

- (i) *(i) being in company with one or more specified persons;*
- (ii) *(ii) communicating in any way (including by post, fax, phone and other electronic means, and whether directly or indirectly) with one or more specified persons; and*

(b) *the person contravenes the notice.*

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for two years.

(2) *It is a defence for an offence against subsection (1) if the defendant proves that:*

- (a) *the defendant has a reasonable excuse; or*
- (b) *the defendant, having unintentionally associated with a person specified in the notice, terminated the association immediately.*

(3) *In subsection (2), a reference to an association with the specified person is a reference to being in company, or communicating, with the specified person in contravention of the notice.*

(4) *The Commissioner may give a notice to a person (the **notified person**) under subsection (1) only if:*

- (a) *the notified person and each person specified in the notice (a **specified person**) have each been found guilty of a prescribed offence; and*
- (b) *the Commissioner reasonably believes that giving the notice is likely to prevent the commission of a prescribed offence involving:*

- (i) *two or more offenders; and*
- (ii) *substantial planning and organisation.*

(5) *The notice must specify:*

- (a) *the notified person's obligations under the notice; and*
- (b) *the consequences of contravening the notice.*

(6) *The Commissioner must ensure all reasonable steps are taken to explain to the notified person (in language the notified person can readily understand) the matters mentioned in subsection (5)(a) and (b).*

(7) *In addition, the Commissioner must give each specified person a notice under subsection (1) imposing similar obligations in relation to prohibiting the specified person from one or both of the following:*

- (a) *being in company with the notified person and each of the other specified persons;*
- (b) *communicating with the notified person and each of the other specified persons.*

(8) *However, the Commissioner may disregard subsection (7) in exceptional circumstances.*

(9) A notice under subsection (1) is not invalidated by a failure to comply with subsections (6) to (8).

(10) A reference to a prescribed offence in subsection (4) is a reference to an offence:

(a) prescribed by regulation; and

(b) the maximum penalty for which is imprisonment for ten years or more.

This offence is part of the ‘anti gang’ legislative package and is “designed to stop organised, high level criminal group behaviour”⁹⁰. The offence requires a notice to be given to the person directing him or her not to communicate with or be in the company of specified people. Both the person given the notice and the specified person must each have been found guilty of a prescribed offence⁹¹, (an offence for which the maximum penalty is ten years or more, and includes terrorism, murder, serious drug offences, piracy, and various child sex and pornography offences, etc.), and the notice can only be given if the Commissioner thinks that giving the notice is likely to prevent the commission of a planned offence.

There is a defense of ‘reasonable excuse’ and it is a defense to the charge if the defendant, unintentionally having ‘associated’ with the specified person, immediately terminates the association.

Police are concerned that the section is limited in respect of the offences to which it applies, and would like the prescribed offence to carry five years rather than ten years and for the subsection 55A(10)(a) be amended by substituting “and” with “or”. (meaning the prescribed offence must be either prescribed by regulation or have a maximum penalty of five years).

This amendment desired by Police however is not consistent with the aims of the provision as indicated in the second reading speech which says the legislation is aimed at “serious criminals with a track record of highly-organised gang related activities”⁹². An offence carrying only five years would not be a serious enough offence and would unnecessarily widen the net by including relatively minor offenders.

There have to date been no prosecutions under this section.

Recommendation for section 55A

This provision and the maximum penalty of 2 years should be retained.

Section 56 – Offences

(1) Any person who:

(c) wanders abroad, or from house to house, or places himself in any public place, street, highway, court, or passage, to beg or gather alms, or causes or procures or encourages any child so to do;

(e) has on or about his person, without lawful excuse (proof whereof shall lie upon the person charged), any deleterious drug, or any article of disguise; or

(i) habitually consorts with reputed criminals,

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$500 or imprisonment for three months, or both.

⁹⁰ Second reading speech.

⁹¹ **Prescribed offences** An offence against any of the following provisions is prescribed for section 55A(10)(a) of the SOA: Criminal Code sections; 54, 55, 66, 73, 125B, 125E, 131A, 132, 156, 160, 165, 176, 177, 202B, 202C, 202D, 211, 213, 228, 229, 231B, and 231C. *Misuse of Drugs Act* sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11. *Firearms Act* 61, 61A and 63A

⁹² Second reading speech by Dr Peter Toyne.

This section catches many various and different offences, including begging, carrying drugs, possessing disguises, and consorting with criminals.

Section 56(1)(c)

This offence has been charged eight times between 2000 and 2007 and has not been charged since.

This subsection criminalises begging or gathering alms. Begging is one of the old offences whose genesis was the *Vagrancy Act 1824*. It could be classed as a status offence, by criminalising poverty or homelessness, although the actual act prosecuted is begging. Some jurisdictions have abolished it as an offence, although Victoria after initially considering abolishing the offence, re-enacted it in 2006.

Research around the world suggests a complex relationship between poverty, begging, drug use, psychiatric and physical disability and homelessness⁹³. Begging is recognised as a problem by the media, politicians, shopkeepers, Police, welfare agencies, the general public, and the actual people who beg.⁹⁴

Some see begging as an expression of broader social problems of homelessness, unemployment or discrimination, which if addressed would mean that begging would no longer be an issue. Others see begging as being symptomatic of crime and public order problems and say begging is chosen by the beggar. Begging in the Northern Territory is overwhelmingly an indigenous problem and generally coincident with alcohol abuse. It is different from the southern jurisdictions where research by the Australian Institute of Criminology has shown beggars to be predominantly young, male and socially marginal.

NAAJA says the offence targets their clients and penalises those who are least able to afford fines. They suggest it should be either repealed or replaced by an offence of seeking donations under false pretences or fraud. NAAJA say the Police do not need this offence to move people on as there are other powers they can use, such as the current section 47 or whatever replaces it.⁹⁵

Arguments for retaining the law against begging include that it is a public nuisance, is not necessary in a welfare state, and having this law discourages the practice.

Police say having an offence against begging is necessary, as even though there are very few arrests for begging, having the offence on the books enables them to move people along from public places where they may be begging and being a nuisance, and having this power has meant that begging is not seen as a real problem in Darwin.

The Victorian provision is short. Section 49A(1) says:

“A person must not beg or gather alms”.

It could be argued the reference to ‘gather alms’ is superfluous. Victoria’s subsection 49A(2) says a child must not be procured or encouraged to beg. Soliciting donations for charities and busking are implicitly excluded from this.⁹⁶

93 Kate Driscoll and Liz Wood, *A Public Life: Disadvantage and Homelessness in the Capital City* (1998). Commissioned by the City of Melbourne on behalf of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology Centre for Applied Social Science Research. See also Caslon Analytics Begging @ <http://www.caslon.com.au/beggingnote.htm> accessed 6 January 2010

94 Philip Lynch ‘*Understanding and Responding to Begging*’ (2005) MULR 16. <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/MULR/2005/16.html#Heading40> accessed 20 November 2009

95 It is suggested that it be replaced by Queensland’s section 6 ‘Public Nuisance’.

96 As distinct from the Queensland Act Section 8(2) which provides explicitly for the exception of charities registered under the *Collections Act 1966*, and for buskers authorised by the local government.

In England the offence is 'persistent begging' or begging 'by going house to house'.⁹⁷

In Queensland's section 8 the offence includes begging for goods:

A person must not –

- (a) beg for money or goods in a public place; or*
- (b) cause, procure or encourage a child to beg for money or goods in a public place; or*
- (c) solicit donations of money or goods in a public place.*

Registered charities are excluded from the provision as is authorised busking.

In NZ the offence is 'Seeking donations by False Pretences'.⁹⁸

NT Police say the addition of the words 'using false pretences' to our legislation would make more difficult their practical use of the offence, which is as a moving along power to prevent 'humbugging'.

An alternative and preferable approach is to decriminalise the actual offence of begging and to have an offence instead of not moving on when asked by Police while begging. There could be a two tiered offence that says Police can move someone on who is begging, and it is an offence not to move on after being requested to by Police. The offence would be something like:

- (1) A Police Officer may instruct a person who is begging to move away from the area.*
- (2) Failure to comply with that request is an offence.*

This has the benefit of not criminalising the begging itself, but instead dealing with the mischief of the public nuisance and confrontation associated with begging by giving the Police the power to move beggars on.

There should also however be a third subsection forbidding the procuring of children to beg.

Section 56(1)(e)

Criminalising having an article of disguise is aimed at conduct preparatory to committing another offence such as robbery or burglary. Someone having an article of disguise for a legitimate purpose such as fancy dress or having a balaclava for skiing would have a lawful excuse. The onus of proving a lawful excuse however rests on the person charged.

Victoria has legislation introduced in 2005 criminalising 'being disguised with unlawful intent'⁹⁹ This includes 'Being disguised or have a blackened face; or have an article of disguise in his or her custody or possession.' This offence, as with the 'Loitering with intent' still requires 'intent' to be proved, but does not enable intent to be proved by reference to the defendants priors.

There is no definition of 'deleterious drug' in the Act. It has been held in Victoria however that a deleterious drug is one which, unless used with care and with special knowledge of its propensity to do harm, may cause substantial injury to the life or health of the user.¹⁰⁰ The drug in that particular case was cocaine.

Having a deleterious drug would seem to be covered by the *Misuse of Drugs Act*. Other versions of this particular section however have been used to prosecute glue sniffing in other jurisdictions. In the NT the *Volatile Substance Abuse Prevention Act* allows Police to

⁹⁷ Home Office Report para 13-18.

⁹⁸ *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ) section 15

⁹⁹ Section 49C *Summary Offences Act* (Vic) 'Being disguised with unlawful intent'.

¹⁰⁰ *McAvoy v Gray* [1946] VLR 442

confiscate petrol or other volatile substances and apprehend a person when the substance is being used inappropriately e.g. by being sniffed.

There has been argument for the section to use the term ‘disabling substance’ e.g. mace or chlorophorm or other drugs that could be used to stupefy or overpower someone to facilitate the commission of an offence. The *Weapons Control Act* already bans:

“An article designed or adapted to emit or discharge an offensive, noxious or irritant liquid, powder, gas or chemical so as to cause disability, incapacity or harm to another person”.

This would of course include chloroform, capsicum spray or mace.

This offence has been charged as ‘Articles of Disguise’ 15 times in ten years.

Section 56(1)(i)

Habitually consorting with reputed criminals is vague and imprecise. A reputed criminal is presumably someone with a reputation as a criminal. The behaviour this section attempts to criminalise is covered much more thoroughly by section 55A ‘Consorting between known offenders’, although of course this offence is aimed at a much lesser type of criminal. The phrase ‘reputed criminals’ is a hangover from the Vagrancy Acts. This offence should be repealed.

Penalty for proposed new offences (replacing section 56)

It is thus proposed that section 56 be repealed and be replaced by two or more new offences. The first should be an offence of not moving on when begging after being asked to move on by police, and the second (and any further) should deal with possessing burglary tools, articles of disguise and possessing disabling drugs without a reasonable excuse.

New Zealand has the offence of ‘possession of burglary tools’¹⁰¹ with a maximum sentence of 3 months, the Queensland offence¹⁰² carries 12 months. The proposed NT provision which will include possessing burglary tools, disguises, and disabling drugs should carry 6 months (fine of 100 penalty units)

Begging in Queensland¹⁰³ carries 6 months, in Victoria¹⁰⁴ begging carries 12 months. The proposed new NT offences of not moving on while begging should carry a maximum penalty of 3 months (fine of 25 penalty units).

Recommendations for section 56

1. It is recommended that the offence against begging be repealed but replaced with an offence of being requested to move while begging and refusing to leave the area.
The fault element should be intent. The maximum penalty should be 3 months; and
2. There should be separate offences of *“Possessing an article of disguise without a lawful excuse”* and possessing housebreaking equipment, and possessing a disabling drug. The reference to ‘deleterious drug’ should be removed and replaced by one prohibiting having a ‘disabling drug’. This offence should have a maximum penalty of 6 months.
This should be a reverse onus provision with a defence of reasonable excuse.
3. The rest of the section should be repealed.

¹⁰¹ Section 14 *Summary Offences Act 1981* (NZ)

¹⁰² Section 15 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld)

¹⁰³ Section 8 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld)

¹⁰⁴ Section 49A *Summary Offences Act 1966* (Vic)

Section 57 – Offences After Finding of Guilt Under Section 56, &c.

(1) *Any person who:*

- (a) *having been found guilty of an offence under section 56 commits any of the offences mentioned in that section;*
- (b) *solicits, gathers, or collects alms, subscriptions, or contributions under any false pretence, or wanders abroad and endeavours by the exposure of wounds or deformities to obtain or gather alms;*
- (d) *pretends to tell fortunes, or uses any subtle craft, means, or device, by palmistry or otherwise, to deceive and impose upon a person;*
- (e) *has in his custody or possession, without lawful excuse (proof whereof shall be upon the person charged), any picklock, key, crow, jack, bit, or other implement of housebreaking;*
- (l) *being a suspected person or reputed thief, is in, on or near, with intent to commit any offence triable on information in the Supreme Court or any indictable offence, any river, canal, navigable stream, dock, or basin, or any quay, wharf, or warehouse near or adjacent thereto, or any street, highway, or avenue leading thereto, or any place of public resort, or any avenue leading thereto, or any street, highway, or place adjacent; or*
- (p) *leaves his wife or child:*
 - (xvi) *chargeable, or whereby either of them becomes chargeable, to the public; or*
 - (xvii) *without means of support other than public charity,**shall be guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$1,000, or imprisonment for six months, or both.

- (2) *Where any person is found guilty under paragraph (e) of subsection (1), any picklock, key, crow, jack, bit, or other implement of housebreaking in the custody or possession of that person shall be forfeited to the Territory.*
- (4) *Where any person is found guilty under paragraph (j) of subsection (1) any table or instrument of gaming at or with which he has played or betted contrary to the provisions hereof shall be forfeited to the Territory. (NB there is no paragraph (j))*
- (5) *In proving under paragraph (l) of subsection (1), the intent to commit any offence therein specified, it shall not be necessary to show that the person charged was guilty of any particular act or acts tending to show his intent but he may be found guilty if from the circumstances of the case and his known character as proved to the Court it appears to the Court that his intent was to commit that offence.*

Apart from the antiquated language, and the incorrect cross reference to the non-existent paragraph (j), there are a number of problems with this section. This is another section that includes many different offences. It includes among others:

- (a) Committing a second offence against the previous section;
- (b) Begging (again although this time with wounds or deformities);
- (c) Telling fortunes;
- (d) Having custody of housebreaking instruments;
- (e) Being a suspected person or reputed thief, and with intent, being almost anywhere;
- (f) leaving one's wife or child impecunious.

Section 57(1)(a)

Committing a second offence should be covered by the maximum penalty for the actual offence. There should not be an offence of committing a second offence. This comes from the old Vagrancy Acts. It should be repealed.

Section 57(1)(b)

Begging is discussed above in Section 56 'Offences' at p.44.

Section 57(1)(d)

The provision criminalising anyone who 'pretends to tell fortunes'¹⁰⁵ can be traced as far back as the *Witchcraft Act 1735*, from where it found its way into section 6 of the *Vagrancy Act 1824*, and then to section 1 of the *Fraudulent Mediums Act 1951* (which was finally repealed in 2008).

It seems that along with Ireland and Israel, the Northern Territory is one of a dwindling few jurisdictions not to have repealed the *Witchcraft Act 1735* and it still remains on the Statute Books by default. Perhaps it should be repealed?

The fact the defendants honestly believe they are telling fortunes and not pretending to do so is immaterial¹⁰⁶. It is not however an offence to publish horoscopes in a newspaper or magazine. (*Barbanell v Taylor* [1936] 3 All ER 66 KB.)

Fortune telling per se should not be a criminal offence. Nowadays the offence is irrelevant and silly and most people do not take fortune tellers seriously. On the contrary fortune telling is popular at markets, fairs and sideshows and is a form of light entertainment. If fraud is found to be involved then fraud or criminal deception can be charged under the Criminal Code.¹⁰⁷

There have been no convictions for this offence since 2000 and it should be repealed.

Section 57(1)(e)

This again can be traced back to the United Kingdom *Vagrancy Act 1824*. The offence is having custody of 'any picklock, key, crow, jack, bit, or other implement of housebreaking'. This requires 'possession' and naturally, knowledge of the possession. Whether knowledge of the use the crow or jack might be put to is necessary for the charge to be made out is not clear. The onus of proof for intent is reversed and once it is established that the accused has custody or possession there must be a lawful excuse for such custody or possession.

Of course a bricklayer would have a good reason for having a screwdriver or chisel, and anybody might possess a pair of pliers, bolt cutters or a torch. (*R v Stewart* (1932) 96 JP Jo 137).

See also: *R v Patterson* [1962] 1 All ER 340, *R v Ward* [1915] 3 KB 696, *R v Oldham* (1852) 169 ER 587

'Possessing Housebreaking Implement' is an often used offence and has been charged 106 times in the past ten years. This offence could be combined with the offence of carrying articles of disguise.

¹⁰⁵ Section 57(1)(d)

¹⁰⁶ The word used to mean professing or proclaiming, more recently it has come to mean feigning.

¹⁰⁷ s. 227 NTCC

Section 57(1)(l)

The phrase “Being a suspected person or reputed thief” without any definition or explanation should not be in our legislation. The section is vague and imprecise. The supposed circumstance of being a ‘suspected person’ does not merit enough to warrant any action. Who suspects the person, and of what are they suspected? The suspicion could not be proved without evidence of previous offending or of bad character which is of course inadmissible. This provision prohibits such a person from being almost anywhere at all with ‘intent’. This ‘intent’ does not have to be shown by any of the person’s particular acts, but may be proved by virtue of ‘the circumstances of the case and his known character as proved to the Court’. This is a very old, outdated and ludicrous offence and should be repealed.

Police however say they use the provision as a power to get rid of ‘pick pockets’ and other opportunistic thieves and undesirable persons from, for example, the Darwin show, the V8 Super Cars and the Mindil Beach markets. They use it as a ‘move along’ power. They do not charge anyone with this offence but it gives them the power to get known thieves and troublemakers away from these public events. The Police are in a position to know who these people are, recognise them and so use the provision preventatively.

There are however other provisions that Police can use in these places and situations as ‘move along powers’. Section 120 of the *Police Administration Act* says that a member may enter a place being used for a show, exhibition, sport, racing or entertainment, and order a ‘reputed thief’ or someone who is disorderly, indecent or soliciting away from the place. A ‘reputed thief’ is defined in the section as someone who has been found guilty of dishonesty offences at least twice in the past five years. This section can also be used in the same way at Mindil Markets etc. and the SOA subsection is therefore unnecessary.

Section 57(1)(p)

Leaving one’s wife or child is covered by the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth). It should not be a criminal offence.

Recommendations for sections 56 and 57

Repeal both sections 56 & 57 but keep separate offences against:

1. Not moving on after being found begging as discussed in section 56; and
2. Having an article of disguise or housebreaking instruments without lawful excuse as discussed in section 56.

Section 58 – Penalty for Second or Subsequent Offence under Section 57

The penalty on being found guilty of a second or subsequent offence under section 57 is imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months.

There have been no prosecutions since 2000. There should not be a separate offence for being found guilty a second time.

Recommendation for section 58

Section 58 should be repealed.

Section 69B – Inciting to the Commission of Offences

A person who:

- (a) *incites to, urges, aids or encourages; or*
- (b) *prints or publishes any writing which incites to, urges, aids or encourages,*

the commission of an offence or the carrying on of an operation for or by the commission of an offence, is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$2,000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

There have been 31 prosecutions for this offence since 2000.

“The word ‘incite’ means to rouse; to stimulate; to urge or spur on; to stir up; to animate”;
Young v Cassells (1914) 33 NZLR 852 ¹⁰⁸

The actual offence that has been urged does not need to be committed; the person being incited does not need to form the necessary intention to commit the act. It is possible to incite even though it is impossible to commit the offence. See *R v McDonough* (1962) 47 Cr App R 37 where there were no stolen goods but a charge of incitement to receive stolen goods was still valid.

The offence is complete once the inciting or ‘urging’ is proved and a person may “incite” another to do an act by threatening or by pressure, as well as by persuasion; *Race Relations Board v Applin* [1973] 1 QB 813; [1973] 2 WLR 895; [1973] 2 All ER 1190, per Lord Denning.¹⁰⁹

This offence is also covered by section 43BI of the Criminal Code and section 158 of the *Police Administration Act*. We therefore have three incitement offences.

Recommendation for section 69B

Section 69B should be repealed.

Section 74 – Power to Regulate Traffic in Certain Cases

- (1) *The Commissioner may, as occasion arises, give directions either in writing, orally, or by any agency which he thinks fit:*
 - (a) *specifying the route to be observed by motor vehicles, vehicles of any other kind, horses, and persons, and for preventing the obstruction of the streets and thoroughfares on any occasion of public procession, public rejoicings, or public illuminations;*
 - (b) *for keeping order, or for preventing any obstruction of the streets or thoroughfares in the immediate neighbourhood of any public building, public office, theatre, or place of public resort; and*
 - (c) *for keeping order, or for preventing any obstruction of the streets or thoroughfares on any occasion when the streets or thoroughfares are thronged or are liable to be obstructed.*
- (2) *The Commissioner may delegate his powers under this section in any particular case to any Superintendent or Inspector of Police.*

¹⁰⁸ Cited in *R v Eade* (2002) 131 A Crim R 390 (NSW CCA) by Smart AJ

¹⁰⁹ See also; *Walsh v Sainsbury* (1925) 36 CLR 464

R v Massie [1999] 1 VR 542; (1998) 103 A Crim R 551

(3) *Any person who, on being requested by any member to comply with any direction given pursuant to this section, fails to forthwith comply with such direction, shall be guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$200.

The drafting style is archaic and is open to improvement, although it seems to the author a pity to lose ‘public rejoicings, or public illuminations’.

This again is an offence where civil rights meet public order. The section’s main purpose is for keeping order and to prevent obstruction in streets and thoroughfares etc. during public processions and the like. Case law suggests that obstruction of the street or thoroughfare is the unreasonable use of the same. A procession usually does in fact cause an obstruction but it is a time honoured and reasonable use of a road or street to have religious, political and other celebratory or ceremonial processions from time to time. Common sense and the use of Police discretion is what saves this offence and others like it from being oppressive.

This is a section giving Police positive powers to regulate movement through public space and that power is necessary. It needs rewriting, updating and rationalising so that it can fulfil its primary purpose.

SA has section 59 ‘Regulation of Traffic in Certain Cases’¹¹⁰ which gives the power to the commissioner (and the mayor or counsel chairman) to give directions regulating traffic of all kinds in ‘any street road or public place’ on ‘special occasions’ which are defined to mean when the street or thoroughfare is likely to be particularly crowded.

Police suggested an ancillary power is needed to close off streets in siege situations. This power exists anyway so as to keep the public safe, and does not need to be repeated here.

This section gives Police a necessary power but needs work. A lot of the mischief it purports to address is already covered in the *Traffic Act*. The section is not, as its title suggests, directed solely at the management of traffic. It is instead directed at managing movement of the public, keeping order and preventing obstruction through public spaces including in certain circumstances, streets, thoroughfares and roads.

Penalty for section 74

The current maximum penalty for breach of section 74 is \$200. This is too low to provide any meaningful deterrent for the worst case offence. A more appropriate maximum penalty is 5 penalty units.

Recommendation for section 74

1. The section should be rewritten along the lines of the SA section and left in the SOA.
2. The maximum penalty should be 5 penalty units

Section 75 – Prohibition of Nuisances in Thoroughfares

(1) *Any person who, in any street, road, thoroughfare, or public place:*

(b) *turns loose any horse or any cattle; or*

(c) *by negligence or ill-usage in driving cattle causes any mischief to be done by those cattle, or in any way misbehaves himself in the driving, care, or management of those*

¹¹⁰ Section 59 *Summary Offences Act 1953* (SA)

cattle, or, not being hired or employed to drive those cattle, wantonly and unlawfully pelts, hurts, or drives any such cattle; or

- (d) (i) *being the driver of any wagon, cart, or dray of any kind not drawn by horses properly driven with reins, rides upon any such wagon, cart, or dray, not having some person on foot to guide the same; or*
- (ii) *being the driver of any carriage whatsoever, is at such a distance from such carriage, or in such a situation whilst it is passing along any street, road, thoroughfare, or public place, that he cannot guide and control the horses or cattle drawing the same; or*
- (iii) *rides upon the shafts of any wagon, cart, dray, or other vehicle whatsoever; or*
- (iv) *riding a bicycle or on horseback, or driving or propelling any wagon, cart, dray, or coach, or any other carriage or vehicle whatsoever, on meeting any other person riding a bicycle or on horseback, or driving or propelling any wagon, cart, dray, or coach, or any other carriage or vehicle whatsoever, does not keep his bicycle, horse, wagon, cart, dray, coach, carriage, or vehicle on the left or near side of the road; or*
- (v) *in any manner prevents any other person from passing him or any vehicle under his care, or prevents, hinders or interrupts the free passage of any vehicle or person; or*
- (e) (i) *causes any cart or vehicle (except standing for hire in any place not forbidden by law), or any truck or barrow, with or without horses, to stand longer than is necessary for loading or unloading or for taking up or setting down passengers; or*
- (ii) *by means of any cart or carriage, or any truck or barrow, or any horse or other animal, wilfully interrupts any public crossing, or wilfully causes any obstruction in any thoroughfare; or*
- (f) *after notice of any regulations made under section 74, wilfully disregards any such regulation, or does not conform thereto; or*
- (g) *without consent of the owner or occupier, affixes any posting bill or other paper against or upon any building, wall, or fence, or writes upon, soils, defaces, or marks any building, wall, or fence with chalk or paint, or in any other manner whatsoever; or*
- (j) *flies any kite, or plays any game, to the annoyance of the inhabitants or passengers in any street, road, thoroughfare, or public place, or to the common danger of the passengers therein; or*
- (k) *turns loose, or suffers any kind of swine or goats belonging to him or under his charge to stray or go about or to be tethered or depastured, in any street, road, thoroughfare, or public place,*

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$200.

- (1) *It shall be lawful for any member to take into custody, without warrant, any person who commits any such offence as mentioned in this section within view of that member.*

There has been one prosecution for ‘nuisances in thoroughfares’ and five for ‘bill posting’ in the last ten years.

The main mischief this section addresses is obstruction of roads and other public places and if it is to be kept, the offence needs rewriting.

This is another very old section that covers a lot of ground, from negligently driving cattle or carriages, not keeping to the left, hindering traffic and obstructing a thoroughfare, to flying a kite annoyingly, letting goats or swine stray, right through to bill posting and graffiti. There is a lot of overlap between this offence and the previous section 74. They both deal with obstruction of passage through public space in one way or another.

While there is a need for prohibiting nuisances in thoroughfares there is no need for the pedantic detail gone into in this section. There is no need for the subsections on: (b) turning cattle loose, (c) driving cattle badly, (d)(i) driving a dray badly, (d)(ii) being too far away from a carriage to guide it, (d)(iii) riding on the drays shaft, (d)(iv) not keeping left, (j) flying kites or playing games and annoying someone, or (k) allowing goats or pigs to wander around in public. All those subsections do is describe a multitude of different nuisances and different ways of obstructing free passage through public places.

There is value in having a provision dealing with obstructing thoroughfares, and creating nuisances which obstruct free passage through various public places.

NSW has a streamlined section 6 'Obstructing Traffic':

A person shall not, without reasonable excuse (proof of which lies on the person), wilfully prevent, in any manner, the free passage of a person, vehicle or vessel in a public place.

The NSW section solves the problem without the extensive verbiage of the NT section, by simply prohibiting the wilful obstructing of free passage in a public place. The 'public place' would include thoroughfares, roads, shopping centres and parks and any other place used by the public. The reversal of onus, would seem to allow for traditional freedoms of political expression and misadventure.

GRAFFITI

Section 75(1)(g) says that any person who:

without consent of the owner or occupier, affixes any posting bill or other paper against or upon any building, wall, or fence, or writes upon, soils, defaces, or marks any building, wall, or fence with chalk or paint, or in any other manner whatsoever;

...is guilty of an offence

This offence carries a \$200 fine.

This provision is sometimes used to prosecute graffiti producers. Bill Posting however does seem recently to have taken a back seat to the offence of graffiti with its socially confrontational aspect.

Graffiti writing or drawing, whether political, obscene, or just 'tagging', on public and private buildings and structures is regarded seriously in many quarters. The Northern Territory covers the offence with section 251 of the NT Criminal Code 'Criminal Damage in General',

(1) Any person who unlawfully damages any property is guilty of an offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years.

It is covered also by council by-laws, such as Darwin City Council by-laws section 98, which states:

Writing, defacing, &c.

A person who, without a permit, writes on, defaces or marks a power pole, sign, post, fixture, wall or pavement in a public place with writing or pictorial representation commits a regulatory offence.

(The council also provides assistance to clean up graffiti, by providing graffiti cleanup kits and paint vouchers to assist residents and owners in removing the graffiti from private property.)

Some other jurisdictions have separate Graffiti provisions in their summary offences legislation. Queensland has prohibited selling spray cans to minors¹¹¹ and has devoted Part III of its *Summary Offences Act*, consisting of 18 sections, to graffiti, its removal and the registration of Graffiti removal officers, including their conditions, qualifications and appointment.

NZ has a slightly more succinct approach with 11A and 11B in its Criminal Damage section prohibiting 'Graffiti vandalism, tagging, defacing etc.112' and 'Possession of Graffiti implements'113. The offence of possessing graffiti implements carries a sentence of community work. They also prohibit selling spraypaint cans to minors¹¹⁴ and prohibit shops from having spraypaint cans within easy reach¹¹⁵.

Victoria and NSW have each devoted a whole Act to the problem.¹¹⁶ Victoria's Act provides search and seizure powers without warrants to Police, and entry powers to private property for the council to clean it up. The main provision states:

"A person must not mark graffiti on property if the graffiti is visible from a public place unless the person has first obtained the express consent of the owner, or an agent of the owner, of the property to do so."

If it were thought desirable to have an offence for graffiti this section would be adequate for the offence of making graffiti. Another section should then prohibit selling spray paint cans to minors. The rest of the Victorian Act devoted to search and seizure etc is unnecessarily draconian and intrusive, and anyway the problem is nowhere near as bad in the NT as it is in Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne. The NSW Act includes provisions for 'community clean up orders' and 'graffiti prevention programs', as consequences of being found guilty.

Although the Darwin and some other town's by-laws prohibit 'Writing, defacing etc.,' as a regulatory offence there is still a need for it to be an offence in the SOA. The graffiti offence should be a separate discrete section for unlawful graffiti and bill posting on public transport, structures and public and private buildings. The section should have a reverse onus for the issue of consent.¹¹⁷ There should also be a corresponding prohibition on selling spray paint cans to minors.¹¹⁸

111 *Summary Offences Act 2005* (Qld) s.23A

112 Section 11A *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NZ)

113 Section 11B *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NZ)

114 Section 14A *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NZ)

115 Section 14B *Summary Offences Act 1988* (NZ)

116 *Graffiti Prevention Act 2007* (Vic); *Graffiti Control Act 2008* (NSW)

117 A building owner may like graffiti on the building.

118 NSW has the offence of selling Spray paint cans to minors but it was not used in the first two years of its operation.

Penalty for section 75

The current maximum penalty for breach of section 75 is \$200. This is too low to provide any meaningful deterrent for the worst case offence. A more appropriate maximum penalty is 5 penalty units.

Recommendation for section 75

1. This provision should be replaced with a streamlined section similar to the NSW section 6 'Obstructing Traffic'.
2. There should be a separate section prohibiting bill posting and writing or drawing graffiti without the consent of the owner of the property.
3. There should be a separate offence of selling spray paint cans to minors.
4. All three offences should carry 5 penalty units

Section 76 – Playing Musical Instruments so as to annoy

- (1) *Every householder personally, or by his servant, or by any member, may require any street musician to depart from the neighbourhood of his house, on account of the illness of any inmate of the house or for any reasonable cause.*
- (2) *Every person who sounds or plays upon any musical instrument in any thoroughfare near to and so as to be heard at the house, after being so required to depart, shall be guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$200.

- (3) *Every person who sounds or plays upon any musical instrument, and against whom an information has been laid by any inhabitant who is annoyed by the sounding or playing of the musical instrument, or by any member upon the written complaint of the inhabitant, shall be guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$200.

The provision against 'the playing of a musical instrument so as to annoy' had as its source the *Metropolitan Police Act 1864* (UK). A private members bill was brought by a Mr Bass who was continually disturbed while reading 'The Times' by street bands. Sir Robert Peel also supported the bill as it was necessary "for putting down the abominable nuisance of street organs", one of which used to play Psalm 100 every Saturday morning next to his house.

This is basically an offence against busking, and as few find busking offensive in Darwin, and indeed many find it pleasant, there is no need to make it a criminal offence. Buskers can get a permit in Darwin from Darwin City Council for a small fee. If the busking is a nuisance it can be dealt with by the nuisance provisions (see section 47). There have been no convictions since 2000.

Recommendation for section 76

Section 76 should be repealed.

4. NOISE PROVISIONS

These are necessary provisions. There are no noise provisions in the Darwin City Council by-laws or in any other by-laws made by local government bodies under the *Local Government Act*.

Section 53A – Undue Noise at Social Gathering after Midnight

- (1) *A member of the Police Force may, in response to a complaint from a person that undue noise is coming from any premises or part of premises where a social gathering is being held, being a complaint in respect of noise made after midnight on any night and where he considers that such noise constitutes undue noise, direct:*
- (a) *the person who is the occupier of the premises or part of the premises, as the case may be; or*
 - (b) *if that person cannot be ascertained, the person responsible for the noise or in charge of the property producing the noise,*
to stop or abate the noise.
- (2) *Where, at any time during the period of 12 hours immediately after a person has been directed under subsection (1) to stop or abate undue noise (other than the period of ten minutes after the direction is given), undue noise comes from the premises or part of the premises in respect of which the complaint was made, the person to whom the direction was given is guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$2,000.

This has been charged seven times in the last ten years.

Section 53B – Undue Noise

- (1) *A member of the Police Force may, in response to a complaint from a person that undue noise is coming from any premises or part of premises and where he considers that such noise constitutes undue noise, direct:*
- (a) *the person making or causing or permitting the noise to be made; or*
 - (b) *the person apparently at the time in charge of the premises or part of the premises, as the case may be,*
to stop or abate the noise.
- (2) *A member of the Police Force may, in response to a complaint from a person that undue noise is coming from any unoccupied land and where he considers that such noise constitutes undue noise, direct the person making the noise or causing or permitting the noise to be made to stop or abate the noise.*
- (2A) *A direction under subsection (1) or (2):*
- (a) *may be given by reference to a period of hours during which, or specific times when, the noise is to be stopped or abated; and*
 - (b) *in any event, shall remain in force for not more than 48 hours.*

- (3) *A person who has been directed under subsection (1) or (2) to stop or abate undue noise and who, other than during the period of ten minutes immediately after being so directed:*
- (a) *continues to make the noise or continues to cause or permit the noise to be made; or*
 - (b) *does not abate the noise,*

in contravention of the direction is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$2,000.

This has been charged 20 times in the last ten years.

Section 53C – Certificate of Member of the Police Force to be Evidence

In a prosecution for an offence against section 53A or 53B a certificate by a member of the Police Force stating that a complaint of a kind referred to in those sections had, at a specified time and on a specified date, been made is prima facie evidence of the matters stated in the certificate.

Section 53D – Noise Abatement Orders

- (1) *Where a person occupying premises makes a complaint to a Justice alleging that his occupation of those premises is affected by undue noise, the Justice may issue his summons for the appearance before him or any other Justice of the person who is:*
- (a) *alleged to be making or causing or permitting the noise to be made; or*
 - (b) *the occupier or person apparently in charge of the premises or part of the premises from which the noise is alleged to be emitted.*
- (2) *If the Court is satisfied that an alleged undue noise exists, or that although abated it is likely to recur on the same premises or part of the premises, the Court may, where it finds that such noise is not justified in the circumstances, make an order directing the person summoned under subsection (1) to stop or abate the noise or to confine the making of the noise to within such hours as the Court may fix and the Court may, in making the order, impose such other conditions as it thinks fit.*
- (3) *A person shall not contravene or fail to comply with an order made under subsection (2).*

Penalty: \$2,000.

(4) *Where:*

- (a) *a direction has been given under section 53A or 53B; and*
- (b) *a member is satisfied that another person requires the name and address of the person to whom the direction was given for the purposes of making a complaint under subsection (1) in respect of that person or instituting any civil suit or proceeding in respect of the noise the subject of the direction,*

the member may provide the other person with the name and address of the person to whom the direction was given.

- (5) *Where the Court makes an order under subsection (2), the Court may order the defendant to pay to the complainant such costs as it thinks fit.*
- (6) *Where the Court refuses to make an order under subsection (2), the Court shall not award costs against the complainant unless the Court is satisfied that the complaint made was vexatious or unreasonable.*

This has been charged once in the last ten years.

Section 53E – Powers of Police

- (1) *For the purposes of giving a direction under section 53A or 53B, a member of the Police Force may enter the premises or the part of the premises from which the noise is coming together with such assistance and using such force as the member considers reasonable for the purpose.*
- (2) *A member of the Police Force who enters premises or a part of premises under this section may require a person in the premises or the part to answer a question asked for the purpose of identifying the occupier of the premises or the part or the person responsible for the noise or in charge of the property that is producing the noise.*
- (3) *A person asked a question under subsection (2) shall not refuse or fail to answer the question to the best of his knowledge or belief.*

Penalty: \$200.

Section 53F – Compliance with direction

For the purposes of a prosecution of an offence against sections 53A and 53B, it is immaterial that noise coming from the premises or the part of the premises after a direction has been given is not of the same nature or of the same level as the noise to which the direction given

Noise provisions are necessary for the peaceful enjoyment of life, and the offences are offences of a public order nature.

Penalties for sections 53A-53E

The current maximum penalty for breach of sections 53A-53S is \$2000. This appears to be the appropriate level and, expressed in round terms, is 20 penalty units.

The maximum penalty for breach of section 53E is \$200. This appears to be the appropriate level and, expressed in round terms, is 2 penalty units.

Recommendation for sections 53A-53F

1. Sections 53A to 53F should remain in the SOA.
2. All offences should carry 20 penalty units except 53E which should carry 2 penalty units.

5. TRESPASS OFFENCES

These offences are descended from the Forcible Entry Acts 1381-1623 which sought to force owners of land to go to court to get land returned rather than resort to unbridled self help.

The offences were resurrected in the UK in the 1970s to penalise squatting and industrial occupation of premises or land by students and workers. They were introduced to the NT Act in 1983 for the same reasons. The main purpose of the law according to the UK Law Commission is “to prevent breaches of the peace”.

SA has combined these two offences into one.¹¹⁹ The ACT has two almost identical provisions¹²⁰ to ours.

The Northern Territory *Trespass Act* does not cover the situations this provision envisages.

Section 46A – Forcible Entry

A person who, in a manner likely to cause a breach of the peace or reasonable apprehension of a breach of the peace, enters, whether or not he is so entitled to enter, land which is in the actual and peaceable possession of another is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months.

There have been 16 prosecutions for this offence since 2000.

Section 46B – Forcible Detainer

A person who, being in actual possession of land without being entitled by law to possession, holds possession of it in a manner likely to cause a breach of the peace or reasonable apprehension of a breach of the peace against a person entitled by law to the possession of the land is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 12 months.

This is a complimentary provision to section 46A Forcible Entry and is to prevent the squatter or occupier of premises or land from initiating a disturbance while trying to prevent him or herself from being removed. It is used for example to protect against possible violent confrontations in sit-ins and lockouts.

There have been no prosecutions for this offence since 2000.

These offences would be better placed in the *Trespass Act* as they are to do with ownership and occupancy of land and the rights and restrictions pertaining to that ownership or occupation.

Recommendation for sections 46A and 46B

Sections 46A & 46B should be retained and moved to the *Trespass Act*.

The fault element should be intent.

¹¹⁹ Section 17D *Summary Offences Act 1953* (SA)

¹²⁰ Sections 151 & 152 *Crimes Act 1900* (ACT)

6. DISHONESTY OFFENCES

These are generally lower level dishonesty offences than the dishonesty offences in the Criminal Code. Some of them double up with the Criminal Code offences and so should be repealed. Some however have differences, with for example evidentiary rules or in the offences overall criminality, that make them worth retaining.

Section 49A – Illegal Use of Vehicle, &c.

(1) *Any person who, without reasonable excuse:*

- (a) *interferes with or tampers with any vehicle;*
- (b) *works or uses any horse or other beast of burden; or*
- (c) *interferes with, tampers with or goes on board a boat,*

without the consent of the owner or the person in lawful charge thereof, shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$1,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

(2) *A Court which finds a person guilty of an offence against this section may order him to pay to the owner of the vehicle, horse, other beast of burden, boat, equipment, material or article in respect of which the offence was committed, a reasonable sum by way of compensation for any loss or damage caused to the owner by the defendant by reason of the commission of the offence.*

(2A) *Where a person is found guilty of an offence against this section, the Court may, in addition to or instead of any other penalty that may be imposed by the Court, suspend any licence to drive a motor vehicle within the meaning of the Motor Vehicles Act that is held by that person for such period as the Court thinks fit.*

(3) *In this section **boat** includes canoe, dinghy, yacht, raft, pontoon, ship and any other like vessel.*

It would seem at first that this is covered to an extent by section 218 Criminal Code ‘Unlawful Use of Vessel, Motor Vehicle, Caravan or Trailer’. The Code offence however does not include bicycles, carts or carriages whereas 49A talks of ‘vehicles’ not just motor vehicles.

Although the heading is ‘Illegal Use’ the actual offence is ‘interferes with’ or ‘tampers’, which is not the same as using or stealing the vehicle. The Criminal Code offence however is ‘Unlawful Use’ of a motor vehicle, which includes what would generally be called stealing.¹²¹ The two offences are thus very different in criminality and effect.

The main practical difference between the Criminal Code offence and the SOA offence are that the Summary offence, as a lesser offence, has a lesser penalty of six months as against two years. The SOA, also allows for suspension of the licence of the offender pursuant to subsection 49A(2A), and compensation to the owner pursuant to subsection 49A(2).

Section 88 of the *Sentencing Act*, ‘Orders for Restitution and Compensation’ covers compensation to the owner anyway, so it is not necessary to have the power to order compensation in the provision itself. Therefore 49A(2) is unnecessary and should be repealed.

¹²¹ The difficulty with calling unlawful use of a motor vehicle ‘stealing’ is the difficulty in proving an intention to permanently deprive the owner of the vehicle. This question does not arise in the Summary offence of ‘interferes with’ or ‘tampers with’ the vehicle.

It is also questionable whether there should be a power to disqualify the licence of the offender in the SOA. Licence disqualification should only be for traffic offences. The offence is not a traffic offence, but a dishonesty offence and should be dealt with as such and should not import a licence disqualification. Subsection 49A(2A) should also be repealed.

The offence of interfering with boats has been used 24 times in the last ten years.

Interfering with a vehicle has been used 1517 times.

Recommendation for section 49A

1. It is recommended that the offence remain but subsections (2) and (2A) are repealed.
2. The reference to working horses and beasts of burden should be repealed.
3. The offence should continue to include boats.
4. The mental or fault element should be intent.
5. The maximum penalty of 6 months should remain but the monetary penalty (of \$1000) should be removed so that the default maximum penalty (50 penalty units) applies.

Section 54 – Stealing Domestic Animals

Any person who steals any dog, or any bird or animal ordinarily kept in a state of confinement and not being the subject of larceny, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$200, in addition to the value of the dog, bird, or animal stolen.

There were three prosecutions for this offence in the last ten years, all of them in 2006 and none since.

It doesn't really matter what a person steals, as long as he or she is unlawfully appropriating property, assuming the rights of ownership, with the intention of depriving the rightful owner and all without the owner's permission. A domestic animal or bird is still property.

There is an offence of falsely branding an animal in the Criminal Code (section 225 'Using registered brands with criminal intention') and section 328 of the Criminal Code says that on a charge of stealing an animal alternative charges of 'using registered brands with criminal intention', or 'unlawfully using an animal' may be used.

This offence in any case uses the word 'steals' and so is covered by Part VII Property Offences and related matters in the Criminal Code.

Recommendation for section 54

Section 54 should be repealed.

Section 60 – Valueless Cheques

Any person who obtains or attempts to obtain any chattel, money, valuable security, credit, benefit or advantage or discharges or attempts to discharge any debt or liability by passing any cheque which is not paid on presentation shall, notwithstanding that there may have been some funds to the credit of the account on which the cheque was drawn at the time it was passed, be guilty of an offence, unless he proves:

- (a) *that he had reasonable grounds for believing that the cheque would be paid in full on presentation; and*

(b) *that he had no intent to defraud.*

Penalty: \$2,000, or imprisonment for 12 months, or both.

This offence is covered to an extent by section 227 Criminal Code ‘Criminal Deception’, but in this offence the onus of proof has been reversed to cover cases where proving an intent to defraud is extremely difficult; such as where there is some money in an account but not enough to cover the amount written or presented.

Where a cheque is returned marked ‘no account’ the offender can be charged with fraud, but where it is returned marked ‘insufficient funds’ it is not possible to prove an intention to defraud as it may just be a mistake. With the reversal of onus the defendant must prove his honourable intentions.

This section was initially enacted to cover situations where a person opens an account with a little money and then wilfully draws cheques far exceeding the amount deposited.

Victoria and SA still have the same section. NSW has a similar section, but in the *Crimes Act 1900*.

There have been 53 charges since 2000.

Recommendation for section 60

This provision and the maximum penalty of 12 months should be retained.

Section 60A – Fraud Other than False Pretences

A person who obtains or attempts to obtain any chattel, money, valuable security, credit, benefit or advantage or discharges or attempts to discharge any debt or liability by fraud other than false pretences shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$2,000, or imprisonment for 12 months, or both.

This offence is covered by section 227 Criminal Code ‘Criminal Deception’ and thus is superfluous.

There have only been four charges since 2000.

All stakeholders submitted that this offence be repealed.

Recommendation for section 60A

Section 60A should be repealed.

Section 61 – Persons Suspected of Having Stolen Goods:

(1) *In this section:*

personal property includes money in cash or cheque form, or deposited in an ADI account or other account.

premises includes a structure, building, vehicle, vessel, aircraft, hovercraft, land or place.

(2) *A person who:*

(a) *has in that person’s custody any personal property;*

(b) *has in the custody of another person any personal property;*

- (c) *has in or on any premises any personal property; or*
- (d) *gives any personal property to a person who is not lawfully entitled to it, being personal property which, at any time before the making of a charge for an offence against this section in respect of the personal property, is reasonably suspected of having been stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained, is guilty of an offence.*

Penalty: \$2,000, or imprisonment for 12 months.

- (3) *It is a defence to a charge for an offence against subsection (2) if the defendant gives to the court a satisfactory account:*
- (a) *as to how the defendant obtained the personal property referred to in the charge; and*
- (b) *of the custody of the personal property by the defendant after it was obtained by him or her for each period during which the defendant had custody of the personal property.*

'Unlawful possession of suspected stolen property' creates an offence for a person to unlawfully possess a thing that is reasonably suspected of having been stolen or unlawfully obtained. It also reverses the onus of proof, requiring the defendant to give an explanation.

The offence derives from the *Metropolitan Police Act 1839* although the early versions did not use the word 'reasonable', which was introduced more recently. The word 'actual' in front of 'possession' was introduced in equivalent sections in 1912. All Australian jurisdictions have a similar law.

Making out stealing or unlawfully obtaining is not an element of the offence, and it is not necessary to show that the offender stole the property or is suspected of having stolen it¹²². The property in the offender's custody must bear 'the taint of illegality'¹²³.

This offence is complementary to the more serious offences of stealing and receiving contained in the Criminal Code. It may be used in instances where the lawful owner of property cannot be located but the circumstances in which a person has possession of property can lead to the conclusion that it has been stolen or unlawfully obtained. For example, a financially destitute person may be found in possession of thousands of dollars worth of new leather goods and be unable or reluctant to give Police an explanation as to how he or she came lawfully by the goods. Where an owner cannot be found due to the fact that the goods may, for example, have been stolen interstate, Police may charge the person under this provision.

The section is founded upon a suspicion regarding the actual goods in the possession of the person, and not the person themselves. That person is then obliged to give an explanation in order to exculpate themselves from the offence. The offence should not be charged however where the prosecution has or is able to obtain, the evidence to support a charge of stealing¹²⁴.

It is a defence in the NT if the defendant gives the court a satisfactory account as to how the property was obtained. In the NSW *Crimes Act 1900*¹²⁵ and the ACT *Criminal Code 2002*¹²⁶, however, instead of requiring the person to give a satisfactory account once possession and suspicion are proved, the legislation provides that it is a good defence if the defendant satisfies the court that he or she had no reasonable grounds for suspecting that the property was stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained.

¹²² *Edwards v Trennery*, JA 99 & JA 177 of 1997, 5 January 1998, Martin CJ

¹²³ *Grant v The Queen* (1981) 147 CLR 503 @ 507.

¹²⁴ *Baldwin v Samuels* (1973) 6 S.A.S.R. 144

¹²⁵ Section 527C

¹²⁶ Section 324

See: *Eupene v Hales* (2000) 10 NTLR 16, *Gorey v Winzar* [2001] NTSC 21, *McDonald v Webster* [1913] VLR 506, 19 ALR 563, *Trainer v The King* (1906) 4 CLR 126, *Grant v The Queen* (1981) 55 ALJR 490, *Nichols v Young* [1992] 2 VR 209

This offence has been charged 1213 times in the last ten years.

Penalty for section 61

The current maximum penalty of imprisonment (12 months) appears appropriate. However, the maximum fine (\$2,000) is too low. It is more appropriate that it be the default level of 100 penalty units.

Recommendation for section 61

This provision and the maximum penalty of 12 months imprisonment should be retained but the monetary amount should be removed so that the default level of 100 penalty units applies.

Section 62 – Where Property Improperly Taken or Stolen is Found and Not Satisfactorily Accounted For

- (1) *Whenever any credible witness proves upon oath before any Justice that there is reasonable cause to suspect that any such property as mentioned in this section has been taken or stolen, and is to be found in any house or other place, it shall be lawful for the Justice to issue a warrant to search the house or place for the property, and any person in whose possession, or on whose premises, any of the property is found by virtue of any such warrant, or by any member of the Police Force when executing any general search warrant or any other warrant, or otherwise acting in the discharge of his duty, who does not satisfy the Special Magistrate or Justices before whom he is brought that he came lawfully by the same, or that the same was on his premises without his knowledge or consent, shall:*
- (a) *if the property so found consists of any goods, merchandise, or other articles belonging to any ship or vessel in distress, or wrecked, stranded, or cast on shore, be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$2,000 or to imprisonment for any period not exceeding 12 months, or both;*
 - (b) *if the property so found consists of the carcass, or the head, skin, hide, fleece, feet, or other part of any cattle, be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$2,000, or to imprisonment for any period not exceeding 12 months, or both; or*
 - (c) *if the property so found consists of the whole or any part of any tree, sapling, or shrub, or any underwood, or any part of any live or dead fence, or any post, picket, rail, stile, or gate, or any part thereof (being of the value of not less than 10 cents), to be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$2,000, or to imprisonment for any period not exceeding 12 months, or both, and in addition shall pay to the party aggrieved the value of the property so found.*
- (2) *Any person who:*
- (a) *offers or exposes for sale any goods, merchandise, or articles (whether found by virtue of a search warrant or not) which have been unlawfully taken, or are reasonably suspected of having been unlawfully taken, from any ship or vessel in distress, or wrecked, stranded, or cast on shore; and*

- (b) *does not satisfy the Special Magistrate or Justices before whom he is brought that he came lawfully by the same, or that the same were on his premises without his knowledge or consent,*
- shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$2,000, or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any period not exceeding 12 months, or both and in addition shall pay such sum as the Special Magistrate or Justices fix as a reasonable reward to the person who seized the goods, merchandise, or articles.*
- (3) *In every case to which the section applies, any person to whom any such property as is therein mentioned is offered for sale, or any officer of the Customs or member of the Police Force, may lawfully seize the same, and shall with all convenient speed cause the same to be removed to a Special Magistrate or two or more Justices, and in every such case it shall be lawful for the Special Magistrate or Justices by whom the case is heard to direct that the property be delivered over to the rightful owner, if known, or, if the rightful owner is not known, that the same be sold, and the proceeds thereof applied in the same manner as any penalties under this Ordinance.*
- (4) *If any person charged with any offence against this section is not found guilty thereof, it shall be lawful for the Special Magistrate or Justices hearing the case, at his or their discretion, to compel the attendance before him or them of any person through whose hands any such property as mentioned in this section, or any part thereof, appears to have passed, and if the person from whom the same was first received, or any person who has had possession thereof, does not satisfy such Special Magistrate or Justices that he came lawfully by the same, he shall be liable to the appropriate punishment provided by this section.*

This offence is descended from the *Indictable Offences Act 1848* (UK), when preliminary examinations were much more inquisitorial.¹²⁷ It is primarily to cover cases where the property has been given to someone as a custodian or carrier and that person has reasonable cause to believe it has been stolen or unlawfully obtained. It is potentially much more far reaching than section 61.

If “any credible witness (?!) proves upon oath before any justice that there is reasonable cause to suspect that any (... property...) has been taken or stolen” and it is found on the property of the defendant, the defendant has to:

“satisfy the Special Magistrate or Justices before whom he is brought that he came lawfully by the same, or that the same was on his premises without his knowledge or consent”.

The offence talks of:

“any ship or vessel in distress, or wrecked, stranded, or cast on shore”.

and

“any tree, sapling, or shrub, or any underwood, or any part of any live or dead fence, or any post, picket, rail, stile, or gate, or any part thereof ...”

This part of the offence comes from *The SA Police Act 1869* which in turn was based on provisions of the United Kingdom *Larceny Act 1861*. The ancient nature of this offence is obvious and rather draconian. It would seem that section 62 covers a broader population than section 61, and could be putting more innocent people at risk.

¹²⁷ See Charles Dickens *The Pickwick Papers* (1836-1837) Ch 25. See also J H Langbein *Prosecuting Crime in the Renaissance* (1974) 5-125.

“(I)t shall be lawful for the Special Magistrate or Justices hearing the case, at his discretion, to compel the attendance before him...of any person through whose hands any such property ...appears to have passed...or any person who has had possession thereof, does not satisfy such Special Magistrate... that he came lawfully by the same...”

It may be appropriate for someone who has possession of the property at the time in question to satisfy the court as to the lawfulness of the acquisition, but it is probably inappropriate for the same burden to be placed on someone who had the property sometime in the past or through whose hands it has passed, as it may be very difficult to assemble the necessary evidence to satisfy the court of the reasonableness of belief as to the lawful provenance of the property.

The punishment of ‘hard labour’ that is allowed as ‘the appropriate punishment provided by this section’, seems quite drastic and thankfully is not applied in our Courts any more.

The main mischief seems to be addressed by section 61, and the offence has not been charged in the last ten years.

Recommendation for section 62

Section 62 should be repealed.

Section 65A – Tampering with Instruments

Any person who:

- (a) with intent to deceive tampers with any instrument or device used for the recording of mileage in a motor vehicle; or*
- (b) with intent to deceive installs in substitution for an instrument or device used in a motor vehicle for recording the mileage of the motor vehicle a new instrument or device for recording the mileage of the motor vehicle,*

shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of not more than \$200.

This provision is a narrower offence and of a lower order of criminality than section 227 Criminal Code ‘Criminal Deception’¹²⁸ and there is still a place for this offence. The offence criminalises the changing of the odometers or the readings on odometers on motor vehicles. It is an offence of dishonesty and the intent to deceive is still required to be proved, but it is not an offence that would seem to deserve a sentence of imprisonment such as section 227 of the Criminal Code carries. It is an economic offence and the penalty should reflect that. There have been no charges since 2000.

Recommendation for section 65A

Section 65A should remain but with a penalty of 20 penalty units.

128 227 Criminal deception

- (1) Any person who by any deception:
 - (a) obtains the property of another; or
 - (b) obtains a benefit (whether for himself or herself or for another),
 is guilty of a crime and is liable to the same punishment as if he or she had stolen the property or property of equivalent value to the benefit fraudulently obtained (as the case may be).
- (1A) In subsection (1), **benefit** includes any advantage, right or entitlement.
- (2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a person **obtains property** if he obtains ownership, possession or control of it and **obtains** includes obtaining for another and enabling another to obtain or retain.
- (3) Any person who by any deception obtains credit or further credit for himself or another, whether for the performance of an obligation that is legally enforceable or for one that is not, is guilty of a crime and is liable to imprisonment for 7 years.
- (4) Any person who, for the purposes of gain for himself or another, by any deception induces a person to engage in any conduct is guilty of a crime and is liable to imprisonment for 7 years.

7. INDECENCY OR OBSCENITY OFFENCES

Obscenity was originally an ecclesiastical offence and now there is fortunately a large body of case law as to meaning of 'obscene'.¹²⁹ and obscenity. The authorities say that the test is objective. For example with language, it is not a question of whether or not the individual who was addressed thought the words were obscene or indecent, but whether objectively in the prevailing circumstances the words meet that description.

The more serious of these offences may be better placed in the Criminal Code¹³⁰. There are obvious difficulties with deciding where the line is drawn as to what is indecent and what is obscene, and what the words actually mean.

Section 50 – Penalty for Indecent Exposure of the Person

Any person who offends against decency by the exposure of his person in any street or public place, or in the view thereof, shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

The language should be less archaic. The word 'thereof' should not be used. The phrase 'his person' means something different now to the meaning it had when the section was first written¹³¹. The offence has been charged 81 times in the last ten years.

Victoria has drafted the offence in clearer language in their section 19:

"A person must not wilfully and obscenely expose the genital area of his or her body in, or within view of, a public place".

It is appropriate that the offence, as in Victoria, should make it clear that there is a mental (fault) element as to exposing a person's genital area in such a way that is obscene. Thus it is not the fact of the exposure but the intention or recklessness behind the exposure which criminalises the act.

Queensland approaches the same problem by using the term 'circumstances of aggravation', which when present, take the penalty from 2 penalty units to 40 penalty units or 12 months imprisonment. A circumstance of aggravation in the Queensland section is to "wilfully expose his or her genitals so as to offend or embarrass another person." The 'wilfully' attaches to the 'so as to offend or embarrass', and so at least recklessness as to offending or embarrassing must be present. Again, an inadvertent or non-offensive exposure is not criminalised.

The Criminal Code contains the offence of 'Gross Indecency in Public' (s.133) which covers more extreme behaviour than that contemplated by this section, such as masturbating or other objectionable obscene behaviour in public. The Criminal Code provision requires an act of gross indecency. This section is solely concerned with exposing one's genitals in public. The fault element should be recklessness.

Penalty for section 50

The current maximum penalty of six months is appropriate for a worst case breach of section 50. The maximum fine of \$2,000 (if converted to 20 penalty units) also appears appropriate despite being lower than the default level of 50 penalty units.

¹²⁹ *Crowe v Graham* (1968) 121 CLR 375 per Windeyer @ 390; *Phillips v Police* (1994) 75 A Crim R 480

¹³⁰ For example section 133 NTCC. 'Gross indecency in public'.

¹³¹ "...today, and indeed by 1824 the word 'person' in connection with sexual matters had acquired a meaning of its own, a meaning which made it a synonym for penis." *Evans v Ewels* [1972] 1 WLR 671; 2 All ER 22.

Recommendation for section 50

- (1) This provision should be rewritten to mirror the Victorian section 19.
- (2) The fault element should be recklessness.
- (3) The maximum penalty should remain at 6 months with the fine to be expressed as 50 penalty units.

Section 53 – Obscenity

(1) *Any person who:*

(a) *in a public place, or within the view or hearing of any person passing therein:*

- (i) *sings any obscene song or ballad, or writes or draws any indecent or obscene word, figure or representation, or uses any profane, indecent or obscene language,*

shall be guilty of an offence.

(7) *A person who in a public place or in licensed premises within the meaning of the Liquor Act :*

(g) *by threatening, abusive or objectionable words or behaviour, offends or causes substantial annoyance to another person; or*

(h) *makes such a noise as might reasonably in the circumstances cause substantial annoyance to another person,*

whether that other person is in the public place, those premises or elsewhere, is guilty of an offence.

(8) *Where the words or behaviour or noise referred to in subsection (7) are or is made in licensed premises within the meaning of the Liquor Act and the Court is satisfied that the licensee might reasonably have taken action to prevent the commission of the offence, the licensee is also guilty of an offence.*

(9) *The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine not exceeding \$2,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or both.*

(10) *The Court hearing a complaint for an offence against this section shall not award costs against the complainant unless the Court considers that the complaint was unreasonably made.*

The title of this offence does not really describe its content. The section criminalises the using of obscene, indecent or profane words or language. The offence overlaps other offences, mainly those in section 47.

There are two different offences left in this section after numerous alterations and subtractions. These are:

- (i) Subsection (1)(a)(i) The singing of an obscene song or ballad, writing or drawing something obscene, or using profane or indecent language.
- (ii) Subsection (7) covering threatening, abusive or objectionable words or behaviour, or noise in a public place or on licensed premises which causes 'substantial annoyance'.

There have been prosecutions of comedians Rodney Rude¹³² and Austin Tayshus¹³³ under similar legislation in WA. Both were charged after public performances. Austin Tayshus was

¹³² *Keft v Fraser* (unreported) WASC 21 April 1986

¹³³ *Carroll v Gutman* (unreported) WASC 19 July 1985

unlucky and was convicted whereas Rodney Rude, at first instance convicted, was then successful in his appeal. It is doubtful whether similar prosecutions would be countenanced nowadays.

NSW has divided the offence into three separate offences. Section 4 'Offensive Conduct', section 4A 'Offensive Language', and section 5 'Obscene Exposure'.

Queensland's section 6 "Public Nuisance" includes offensive, obscene, indecent, abusive or threatening language as offensive behaviour.

53(1)(a)(i)

It is doubtful whether there is a place for a separate offence of obscene language whether or not it involves singing. The offences of 'disorderly behaviour' or 'offensive behaviour' in section 47(a) 'Offensive, &c., conduct' cover this situation. If the language is offensive enough the proper charge is 'offensive behaviour', or 'offensive language'.

There is an intention in Public Order legislation that people should be allowed to enjoy, and have peaceful passage through, public places. If language is going to interfere with that, then it comes within the orbit of 'Offensive behaviour'. To criminalise the use of language itself, without a commensurate causing of distress, or undue offence, or fear however, is too restrictive.

It is very difficult, especially in a place as diverse as the NT, to draw the line that criminalises certain language as offensive or indecent. Language found to be offensive in one setting may not be so in another. Gleeson CJ in *Coleman v Power*¹³⁴ said:

"it is impossible to state comprehensively and precisely the circumstances in which defamatory language in a public place will involve such a disturbance of public order, or such an affront to contemporary standards of behaviour, as to constitute the offence."

Having an offence of 'sings an obscene song or ballad...or uses any profane, indecent or obscene language' is old fashioned and out of touch with modern community standards. Again the language component is subjective. Profane as an adjective means not sacred¹³⁵ or 'blasphemous' and signifies attacking Christianity or perhaps other religions. Profanity in its more commonly understood form as general swearing, is used every day in many places where people congregate such as sports events, pubs and is common in general conversation.

'Use Obscene/Indecent Language' (including writing which was charged four times) has been charged 531 times in the last ten years.

53(7)(a)

This offence is charged as 'Use Objectionable Words in Public Place' which has been charged 891 times in ten years, 'Threatening Behaviour in Public Place' which has been charged 768 times, and 'Objectionable Behaviour in Public Place' which has been charged 34 times.

This gives a total of 1693.

¹³⁴ (2004) 220 CLR 1

¹³⁵ See Oxford dictionary definition.

There is an evolving problem with people's differing and changing standards in their use of words or language. The language today is different from the language of the past and more so from the distant past when this provision was first enacted. Language varies from place to place and from time to time and the expectations of what is appropriate or acceptable language changes according to time, place and circumstance.

Should there be an offence that criminalises words or language that offends or annoys someone? If that someone is a Police officer would one expect them to be made of 'sterner stuff'¹³⁶?. There should always be a reasonable person test for this type of offence or we run the risk of the wowser or overly sensitive people ruling behaviour.

For the speaking of the 'objectionable words' to be criminal behaviour the words must be either 'obscene' (as in section 47) or the saying of them must be 'offensive, disorderly or indecent behaviour'. This again falls within the orbit of section 47.

In fact section 47 covers all the behaviour this provision attempts to cover. Behaviour that is complained of, to be that sort of behaviour that attracts the intervention of the Criminal Law, must be either 'riotous, offensive, disorderly or indecent behaviour' which is already criminalised in section 47.

If the behaviour occurs on licensed premises it is still covered by section 47 as a licensed premises is a public place. There is also a responsibility on the licensee to prevent bad behaviour already covered by the *Liquor Act*¹³⁷, although the person penalised for not evicting someone displaying 'indecent, violent quarrelsome or riotous conduct' is the licensee¹³⁸. There are new *Liquor Act* provisions¹³⁹ which clear up any doubt on Police powers in licensed premises.

Recommendation for section 53

Section 53 should be repealed.

¹³⁶ *Coleman v Power* supra

¹³⁷ *Liquor Act*, section.105 'Permitting Riotous Conduct on or at licensed premises;

A licensee shall not permit indecent, violent, quarrelsome or riotous conduct to occur on or at his licensed premises.'

¹³⁸ Section 121 of the *Liquor Act* requires the licensee to evict anyone who is "intoxicated, violent, quarrelsome, disorderly or incapable of controlling his behaviour".

¹³⁹ *Liquor Legislation Amendment Act 2010*

8. MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES

There are a number of quaint and sometimes historic offences that have found their way into the SOA and defy other categorisation. Most however are out of date and irrelevant and should be repealed.

Section 46C – Disturbing Religious Worship

A person who wilfully and without authorization, justification or excuse, proof of which is on him:

- (a) interrupts or disturbs a meeting of persons lawfully assembled for religious worship;*
- (b) assaults a person lawfully officiating or a person assembled at such a meeting,*

is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Imprisonment for six months.

There have been three prosecutions for this offence since 2000.

Public worship in a regular fashion is the prevailing guide as to what is religious worship. Consequently an open air evangelical meeting has been held not to be religious worship.¹⁴⁰

SA has retained the offence and include weddings and funerals. They define ‘religion’ as “any philosophy or system of belief that is generally recognised in the Australian community as being of a religious nature”¹⁴¹.

NAAJA suggest that in a secular society the offence is ‘abhorrent’, and should be repealed.

Subsection (a) of this offence is covered by section 47 Offensive, &c., Conduct, and subsection (b), the assault, is already addressed by section 188 of the Criminal Code. The provision is therefore unnecessary.

Recommendation for section 46C

Section 46C should be repealed.

Section 52 Injuring or Extinguishing Street Lamps

Any person who wantonly or maliciously breaks or injures any pane of glass, lamp, or lamp post, or extinguishes any lamp set up for public convenience, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment for six months, or both and in addition shall defray the necessary expense of repairing the damage done, to be estimated by the Justice finding the person guilty.

There have been no prosecutions for this offence since 2000.

To injure or extinguish a street lamp would generally require physical damage of some sort. Thus, this provision is covered by section 251 Criminal Code ‘Criminal Damage in General’ and is unnecessary. This is a very old offence dating back to the days of old gas lamps and we are the only jurisdiction in Australasia to retain it. The section has been repealed in the other jurisdictions.

Recommendation for section 52

Section 52 should be repealed.

¹⁴⁰ *Macrae v Joliffe* [1970] VR 61 per Starke J. See also *Gordon v MacNamara* [1907] VLR 89; *Ryan v Hirco* [1922] VLR 504
¹⁴¹ *Summary Offences Act 1953* (SA) s.7A(2)

Section 65AA Dumping of Certain Containers

No person shall abandon a refrigerator, icechest, icebox, article of furniture, trunk or article of a like nature which has in it a compartment of a capacity of 40 litres or 40,000 cm³ or more or any prescribed article on any vacant land or on any dump, tip, sanitary depot, public reserve or public place unless he has, before so abandoning it:

- (a) removed from the compartment every door and lid thereof and the hinges or locks for those doors and lids; or*
- (b) otherwise rendered those doors and lids incapable of being fastened.*

Penalty: \$200.

There have been no charges since 2000. The provision was introduced in 1979 as a safety measure to protect children from accidentally locking themselves in discarded fridges and other similar items with doors that might lock from the outside but are unable to be opened from the inside. SA also penalises selling fridges manufactured after 1962 that cannot be opened easily from the inside. The NT section penalises dumping or leaving such things around. Nowadays however children can't just wander around rubbish dumps. Fridges are now manufactured so they can be opened from the inside and manufacturers of such items are more aware of extended safety concerns in constructing the items.

The Criminal Code has the offences of 'Recklessly endangering life'¹⁴² and Recklessly endangering serious harm'¹⁴³ which depending on the remoteness of the injury to the action of, say, dumping a fridge, could cover leaving dangerous things around for people to injure themselves with.

This is a very specific provision. There are lots of dangerous things one could dump that are not criminalised. SA is the only other jurisdiction in Australasia that has a similar provision¹⁴⁴. It is doubtful whether the section is necessary now.

Recommendation for section 65AA

Section 65AA should be repealed.

Section 66 – Regulation of Places of Public Resort

(1) Every person who has or keeps any house, shop, room, or place of public resort wherein provisions, liquor, or refreshments of any kind are sold or consumed (whether the same are kept or retailed therein or procured elsewhere) who:

- (a) wilfully and knowingly permits drunkenness or other disorderly conduct in the house, shop, room, or place; or*

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$200.

(2) The holder of a licence under the Liquor Act who has been found guilty of an offence against subsection (1) in respect of certain conduct may be prosecuted for an offence against the Liquor Act in respect of the same conduct.

There have been no convictions since 2000. The offence is covered in any case by ss. 121 & 105 of the *Liquor Act*.

¹⁴² Section 174B NTCC

¹⁴³ Section 174C NTCC

¹⁴⁴ We copied parts of the SA provision word for word.

Recommendation for section 66

Section 66 should be repealed.

Section 68A – False Reports to Police

(1) *Any person who falsely and with knowledge of the falsity of his statements represents to any member of the police force that any act has been done or that any circumstances have occurred, which act or circumstances as so represented are such as reasonably call for investigation by the police, shall be guilty of an offence.*

Maximum penalty: \$11,000 or imprisonment for two years.

(2) *In addition to or without imposing a fine on any defendant found guilty under this section, the court may order that the defendant pay to the complainant a reasonable sum for the expenses of or incidental to any investigation made by any member of the police force as a result of the false statement.*

(3) *Any amounts received by the complainant under this section shall be paid by him into the Central Holding Authority.*

(4) *This section shall not be held to restrict the operation of any other enactment or rule of law.*

Similar legislation exists in most other Australian jurisdictions. There is of course a great nuisance and often great cost in following up false reports.

Fraudulent insurance claims are often the reason for committing this offence; see for example *R v Atamain* (unreported VSC 10 February 1989)

This offence has been charged 60 times in the last ten years.

Other jurisdictions have widely varying penalties for this offence.¹⁴⁵ We should retain the current maximum penalty including the monetary penalty of \$11,000 (converted into 100 penalty units) despite the fact that it is lower than the default level of 200 penalty units.

Recommendation for section 68A

1. This provision and the current maximum penalty of two years should be retained.
2. The fault element of the representation should be intention.
3. The fault element of the situation should be knowledge.

Section 68B – Advertising a Reward for the Return of Stolen Property

A person who:

- (a) *publicly offers a reward for the return of property that has been stolen, and in the offer makes use of words purporting that no questions will be asked or that the person producing such property will not be seized or molested;*
- (b) *publicly offers to return to a person who may have brought or advanced money by way of loan on stolen property the money so paid or advanced or any other sum of money or reward for the return of such property; or*
- (c) *prints or publishes such an offer,*
is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$500.

¹⁴⁵ For example NZ section 24 gives it 3 months. Victoria gives in 12 months. SA and WA give 2 years.

The offence was introduced in 1983. There have been no charges in the last ten years. The purpose of the offence is to take away the chance of a thief profiting by first stealing and then returning the stolen goods to their owner on a no questions asked basis.

The offence seems to punish the victim.

Recommendation for section 68B

Section 68B should be repealed.

Section 69 – Penalty For Offences Where no Special Penalty is Appointed

Every offence against this Act for which no special penalty is provided shall render the offender liable to a penalty of not more than \$500, or to imprisonment for any period not exceeding three months, or both.

There should not be any offences for which no penalty is appointed. Every offence should have its particular penalty nominated in the section itself. There are no provisions in the SOA to which section this applies.

Recommendation for section 69

Section 69 should be repealed.

Section 69A – Disobedience to Laws of The Territory

A person who, without lawful excuse, proof of which is on him:

- (a) does an act that he is forbidden to do; or*
- (b) omits to do an act that he is required to do,*

by a law in force in the Territory, unless a penalty intended to be exclusive of all other punishment is expressly provided by such a law, is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Imprisonment for three months.

This was enacted at the same time as the Criminal Code in 1983 probably to catch any mistakes or omissions in the new Code or in other legislation. There is a similar provision in Queensland legislation.

In any Act an offence provision should be clearly described as such and should have a penalty attached. The penalty for offences in other Acts should not be hidden in the SOA or in any other interpretation legislation. The existence of the section can cause drafting problems when there is a desire to create an obligation or duty but with no intention of creating an offence. For an example see section 697 of the *Legal Profession Act* – which disapplied section 69A of the SOA for breaches of that Act that were only intended to operate as disciplinary breaches. Similar issues may arise for legislation, such as Part 5 of the *Consumer Affairs and Fair Trading Act*, which only seek to impose civil obligations.

To the knowledge of the Department of Justice section 69A has not been called on in the past 10 years for use for a prosecution of a section that has no penalty or for the purpose of clarifying whether or not a provision in an Act or in subordinate legislation does create a penalty.

Recommendation for section 69A

Section 69A should be repealed.

Section 75A – Dangerous Dogs

(1) *In this section, a reference to the owner of a dog includes:*

- (a) *the person for the time being under whose control the dog is;*
- (b) *the occupier of premises or a part of premises where the dog is usually kept; and*
- (c) *where the owner has not attained the age of 17 years, a parent or guardian of the owner,*

but does not include an authorised person, within the meaning of the Local Government Act, a member of the Police Force or a person at a pound controlling or keeping a dog in accordance with a by-law of a council, within the meaning of that Act.

(2) *The owner of a dog that:*

- (a) *attacks a person or animal; or*
- (b) *menaces a person or animal,*

is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$5,000.

(3) *It is a defence to a prosecution for an offence against subsection (2) if the owner of the dog proves that:*

- (a) *a person had, without the owner's permission, enticed the dog to attack or menace the person or animal;*
- (b) *the animal attacked or menaced was attacked or menaced on premises owned or occupied by the owner; or*
- (c) *the person attacked or menaced was attacked or menaced on premises owned or occupied by the owner and the person:*
 - (i) *was on the premises for an illegal purpose; or*
 - (ii) *was attacked or menaced other than when proceeding by the shortest practical route from a boundary of the premises to the door of the premises closest to the boundary or from the door to the boundary.*

(4) *A person shall not entice or induce a dog to act in a manner that would render the owner of the dog liable to prosecution for an offence against subsection (2).*

Penalty: \$5,000.

(5) *Where a court finds a person guilty of an offence against subsection (2), it may:*

- (a) *order the destruction of the dog in addition to or instead of the penalty specified in that subsection; and/or*
- (b) *order the person to pay the costs and expenses of and incidental to the impounding of the dog.*

(6) *Where a member of the Police Force believes, on reasonable grounds, that a dog has or may cause serious injury to a person or animal, the member may seize, impound or destroy the dog and for that purpose may enter onto any land (including land that is not open to or used by the public) with or without the consent of the occupier or owner, or a warrant.*

There have been 71 charges in the last ten years.

Police suggest the Act be widened to include other animals, for example pigs, snakes and horses, and say the existing defences are enough to protect responsible owners.

In the NT the problem of dangerous dogs has recently become more contentious with the deaths of people in town camps and a series of serious attacks around Darwin and Alice Springs. Some say the owning of a dog should be more a responsibility than a right.

Various local government bodies, Darwin City Council and Tennant Creek for example, have by-laws controlling dogs and their owners, but for other local bodies, for example Litchfield Shire, it seems the associated expense in maintaining and enforcing that legislation is too great. This is an area of responsibility that, arguably, the Territory Government, rather than local shires, may need to control.

Police say the offence should be a strict liability offence (ie similar to the regulatory offence as it is in section 69 of the Darwin City Council by-laws 'Dog Attack').

Penalty

The penalty should remain roughly where it is, which can be rounded out to 50 penalty units.

Recommendation for section 75A

This provision should be retained.

The penalty should be 50 penalty units.

Section 78 – Keeping Clean Yards, &c.

Any owner or occupier of any premises or place who neglects to keep clean all private avenues, passages, yards, and ways within such premises or place, so as by such neglect to cause a nuisance by offensive smell or otherwise, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$200.

There have been no convictions since 2000. The *Public Health Act* and Council by-laws take care of most of the mischief this provision was introduced to prevent. Accordingly, the section appears unnecessary such that it can be repealed.

Recommendation for section 78

Section 78 should be repealed.

Section 82 – Offences Relating to Public Fountains

- (1) *Any person who damages any public fountain, pump, cock, or water-pipe, or any part thereof, shall pay the cost of repairing the same, and, if the damage is done wilfully, shall, in addition to paying the cost, be liable to a penalty of not more than \$1,000, or imprisonment for six months, or both.*
- (2) *Any person who has in his possession any private key for the purpose of opening any cock, or who in any manner clandestinely or unlawfully appropriates to his use any water from any public fountain or pipe, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$500, or imprisonment for three months, or both.*
- (3) *Any person who opens, or leaves open, any cock on any public fountain or pump, so that the water runs or may run to waste, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$200.*

There have been no convictions since 2000. There does not seem to be any need for the offence. The offence of Criminal Damage (section 251 of the Criminal Code) covers this.

Recommendation for section 82

Section 82 should be repealed.

Section 85 – Leaving Dead Animals in Public Place

Any person who:

- (a) *throws or leaves, or causes to be thrown or left, any dead animal, or any part thereof, upon any street, lane, road or other public place, or into any river, creek, or other stream which flows through, by, or along any such street, lane, road, or public place; or*
- (b) *leaves, or causes to be left, any dead animal, or any part thereof, upon the shores of any such river, creek, or other stream; or*
- (c) *leaves, or causes to be left, any dead animal, or any part thereof, on or upon any private property abutting upon any street, or on or near to any other public place,*

to the annoyance of the inhabitants or of persons passing along or resorting to the street, lane, road, or public place, or of the occupiers of any dwelling-house, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$200.

There have been three charges in the last ten years. Again this is a very old offence and the behaviour is covered by the *Litter Act*.¹⁴⁶

Recommendation for section 85

Section 85 should be repealed.

Section 89 – Cellars or Openings beneath the Surface of Footpaths Prohibited

Any person who makes any cellar, or any opening, door, or window, in or beneath the surface of the footpath of any street or public place, shall be liable to a penalty of \$200 over and above the expense of remedying or removing such cellar, opening, door, or window, such expense to be assessed and allowed by the Justice finding the person guilty.

There have been no charges since 2000. There does not seem to be a need for this provision.

Recommendation for section 89

Section 89 should be repealed.

Section 91AA – Regulatory Offences

An offence of contravening or failing to comply with section 53A(2), 53B(3), 65AA, 74(3), 77(2), 82(3) or (4), or 89 is a regulatory offence.

Section 53A(2) & section 53B(3), which are offences against continuing to make noise after being warned to stop by Police, are regulatory offences.

Section 74(3), Failing to obey Police traffic directions, is already an offence under the traffic act.

¹⁴⁶ Section 7 'Dead animals on street, &c.'

There is no section 77(2).

Section 82(3), is an offence of wasting water from a public fountain and will be repealed anyway.

There is no section 82(4)

Section 89 (Cellars or openings beneath the surface of footpaths prohibited) should be repealed anyway.

If the offences in the Act are redrafted so as to accord with Part IIAA of the Criminal Code the need for section 91AA will disappear as the offences will be drafted in such a way that it is clear whether they operate as strict or absolute liability offences under Part IIAA. This is said noting that such classifications are akin to classifying offences as “regulatory offences” for the purposes of Part II of the Criminal Code.

It is not appropriate to classify (as section 91AA tries to) offences as having a particular nature. This kind of drafting fools readers and leads to long term cross referencing errors as has occurred with section 91AA.

Recommendation for section 91AA

Sections 53A(2) and 53B(3) should be described as strict liability offences in the actual sections of 53A and 53B.

If an offence is a strict liability offence it should describe itself as such in the section. A section wholly devoted to regulatory offences is unnecessary, and section 91AA should be repealed.

Section 92 – Regulations

This is a standard provision in legislation allowing regulations to be made. It needs to be read with sections 65-65D of the *Interpretation Act*. These provisions expand the scope of regulations and, in the case of the Summary Offence Regulations, are the source of the power to make regulations concerning appeals under section 55A of the Act.

SHOULD WE RETAIN THE *SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT*?¹⁴⁷

Assuming we retain some of the offences from the SOA, amend some others to bring them into the 21st Century and introduce new provisions that are deemed necessary, the question remains where should they be located

The offences we have been discussing are less serious, of a lower order of criminality, and carry a lesser penalty than most offences in the Criminal Code. The longest period of imprisonment stipulated is two years and many offences only carry a fine.

These offences are dealt with in the Court of Summary Jurisdiction and not in the Supreme Court. Most of the offences have the common feature of being 'Public Order' offences, which are often used to keep order rather than penalise the breach of order.

The offences therefore need a separate place from the more serious offences but the question remains whether that separate place is a new Part within the Criminal Code for 'summary or public order offences' or outside the Criminal Code in its own (however named) Summary Offences Act.

Other jurisdictions have gone both ways. WA placed their old summary offences in the Criminal Code and the ACT has placed some in the Criminal Code and some in the Crimes Act.¹⁴⁸ The other jurisdictions, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand have kept a separate Act for their summary offences.

It could be argued that getting rid of the SOA and placing the offences in the Criminal Code gets rid of a superfluous Act and leads to greater long term homogeneity between serious and less serious offences when the offences have common underlying elements.¹⁴⁹

There is also an argument that disparate subjects should be in separate Acts. We have a separate Act for drug offences, a separate Act for trespass offences and a separate Act for traffic offences. Most Acts carry offence provisions, and some, for example the *Prostitution Regulation Act* carry serious consequences.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps summary offences by their minor nature and jurisdictional differences should not be in the same Act that contains murder, rape and treason, and instead should be in a separate Act to be dealt with in the Court of Summary Jurisdiction.

The Criminal Code¹⁵¹ says, for the purpose of offences not covered by Part IIAA, there are crimes, simple offences and regulatory offences. The *Interpretation Act* says offences are simple or regulatory offences if they do not carry more than two years imprisonment.¹⁵² These summary offences then are simple or regulatory offences.

There is an old adage, much harder to justify now, that ignorance of the law is no excuse. It would seem preferable that people know what the law is, or at least where the law is, and so have the opportunity to discover it.¹⁵³

147 "When prohibitory laws abound, the people grow poor! When laws are numerous there are many criminals." Lao-tse

148 For example there is section 392 of the *Crimes Act 1900* 'Offensive Behaviour' and section 336 of the *Criminal Code 2002* 'Passing Valueless Cheques'.

149 "A decrease in the quantity of legislation generally means an increase in the quality of life" George Will.

150 Up to 14 years imprisonment for example for inducing an infant to take part in prostitution. (s.13)

151 Section 3 NTCC 'Division of Offences'.

152 Section 38E *Interpretation Act* 'Certain offences crimes'.

153 In the UK the government has created more than 3,500 crimes since 1997 including one for using a non-approved technique for weighing Herring. In 1975 the UK had three volumes of Acts. By 1985 there were five, according to Lord Simon of Glairdsdale speaking in 1990. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1990/jan/31/legislatio-quantity-and-quality>;

A 'Crimes Act' or 'Criminal Code' is where one would expect to find crimes and other offences of a general nature. Would people know what a summary offence is, or where to find it? Would people look for these offences in a Criminal Code or does the phrase 'summary offences' have enough purchase to lead them to a Summary Offences Act? Should there be an Act called the *Public Order (Summary Offences) Act*?

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) It is recommended that the matters at present in Part VI of the SOA relating drinking in public places be placed in the *Liquor Act* and the matters to do with Trespass (section 46A & 46B) are placed in the *Trespass Act*.
- (2) It is recommended that the remaining SOA provisions be amended or repealed as suggested above.
- (3) It is suggested that either:
 - (a) Those SOA provisions in (2) be redrafted in modern Part IIAA style and placed in the Criminal Code, or;
 - (b) Those SOA provisions in (2) are redrafted in modern Part IIAA style and placed in a new *Summary Offences Act*.

OTHER ASSOCIATED MATTERS

Observance of Law Act

Interestingly, the *Observance of Law Act*, which started life as the *Observance of Law Ordinance 1921*, has as its main offence a paraphrase of section 47 of the SOA. The section reads:

Misbehaviour at a public meeting

Any person who, in, at or near any place where a public meeting is being held –

- (a) behaves in a riotous, disorderly, indecent, offensive, threatening or insulting manner;*
- (b) uses any threatening, abusive or insulting words; or*
- (c) in any way whatsoever, except by lawful authority (proof whereof shall lie upon him) obstructs or interferes with any of the proceedings of the meeting or the Chairman in the conduct of the meeting,*

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$40 or imprisonment for three months.

Section 4 says that if in the opinion of the chairman of a meeting a person nearby:

- (a) behaves in a riotous, disorderly, indecent, offensive, threatening or insulting manner;*
- (b) uses any threatening, abusive or insulting words; or*
- (c) in any way whatever, except by lawful authority (proof whereof shall lie upon him) obstructs or interferes with any of the proceedings at the meeting or with the chairman in the conduct of the meeting,*

the Chairman may verbally direct any officer of the Police Force, or the police generally, to remove the person from the place and the neighbourhood thereof.

(2) Upon a direction being given under subsection (1), it shall be the duty of any officer of police to whom it is addressed or who is present at, in or near the place, to remove the person in accordance with the direction.

(3) Any person who obstructs or interferes with any officer of police in the performance of his duty under this section, shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$100 or imprisonment for six months.

These provisions obviously paraphrase section 47 of the SOA.

The only other offence in the Act is section 11:

11. Victimization as to employment and delivery of goods

Any person who, by threats, intimidation, violence, force or any physical act, interferes with the right of any person –

- (a) to carry on his lawful occupation;*
- (b) to obtain or accept or continue in employment; or*
- (c) to obtain any goods or services or the delivery of any goods,*

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: \$100 or imprisonment for six months.

It seems illogical to have a whole act for what is in effect section 47 of the SOA for meetings, and offences of threats, intimidation, violence, and force, which are all covered in the Criminal Code sections 187 and 188.

The Act is one of the old anti union acts and was enacted in 1921 around the time of the Waterfront strikes of the early 20th century. The whole Act should be repealed as any mischief the Act was designed to protect at public meetings or in the pursuance of a lawful occupation is covered adequately by the provisions of the Criminal Code and the SOA.

Recommendation

The *Observance of Law Act* should be repealed.

Final Thought

“If we tore down all the laws, where should we hide from the Devil, and the winds that would blow then?”

St Thomas More (1478 – 1535)

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT REVIEW: SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
LIQUOR RELATED OFFENCES AND POWERS				
s.45D- 45K	Drinking in a Public Place	11	This is mainly about the 2 kilometre law with associated powers and exceptions.	This whole part should be moved to the <i>Liquor Act</i> .
PUBLIC ORDER OFFENCES				
s.47(a)	<p>Offensive &c., conduct</p> <p>Every person who is guilty:</p> <p>(a) Of any riotous, offensive, disorderly or indecent behaviour, or of fighting, or using obscene language...</p>	4553	<p>This is the catch all subsection for nuisance type behaviour.</p> <p>The most frequently used charges in the last 10 years are 'offensive behavior' (488 charges) & 'disorderly behaviour' (3904 charges).</p> <p>Fighting (280 charges), Indecent behaviour (100 charges), and Riotous behaviour (61 charges), have been used minimally. Fighting and riotous behaviour both fit in the 'disorderly' or 'threatening' category.</p> <p>Objectionable words s.53(7)(a) (891 charges) would be included in the language section of the amended s.47.</p>	<p>The offence should be separated into two sections, one for behaviour offences and another for language offences.</p> <p>The behaviour offence should cover disorderly, offensive and threatening behaviour. See for example WA section 74.¹ It should include behaviour in a police station.</p> <p>The offensive language section should be modeled on NSW s. 4A.²</p> <p>Penalty; The behaviour offence should carry 3 months (at present 6 months) to bring NT in line with other jurisdictions.</p> <p>The language offence should not carry imprisonment.</p>
s.47(b)	'disturbing the public peace'	52	This behaviour is covered by subsection 47(a). The meaning of 'disturbing the public peace' is vague, imprecise and an old legal term of art.	Repeal
s.47(c)	'riotous, offensive, etc behaviour in a police station'	1194	This is generally charged as 'Disorderly behaviour' in a police station. It is necessary to have the overall offence including a police station, as a police station is not a public place.	See above s.47(a)

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.47(d)	'offensive behaviour in a dwelling house dressing-room, training-shed or clubhouse'.	157	The offence has only been charged as 'offensive behaviour in a dwelling house' and the other places e.g. dressing room etc do not get charged. The particularisation of other private places is not necessary.	Repeal
s.47(e)	'unreasonably causing substantial annoyance'	253	The offences of 'disorderly, offensive, indecent etc behaviour already cover this. The behaviour, if criminalised, should be objectively criminal behaviour. It should not have to rely on someone somewhere being annoyed. Just being annoying should not be a criminal offence.	Repeal
s.47(f)	'disrupting privacy'	32	This behaviour is not covered by s.47(a). It is the 'Peeping Tom' offence and it should remain an offence just not in this section.	The offence should be retained as a separate Peeping Tom offence. See NZ s. 30. 'Peeping or peering into a dwelling house'. ³
s.47AA	Violent Disorder	756	This offence is a relatively new offence replacing the old offence of 'Affray'. It was enacted in 2006 in response to the disorders in Wadeye and Yuendumu. The provision is already Part IIAA compliant and has the fault element of 'recklessness'.	Retain
s.47AB	Threatening Violence	42	This offence does not make sense in its present form. This behaviour is already covered by section 200 of the Criminal Code.	Repeal
s.47AC	Loitering by Sexual Offender	9	This offence has a reversal of onus requiring the person, if he or she has the requisite prior criminal history and is found 'hiding or lingering' near a school etc., to have a 'reasonable excuse' for being there. This is a 'status offence' and is intended to be.	Retain
s.47A(1)	Loitering General Offence; 'A person loitering in any public place who does not give a satisfactory account of himself...'	9	Subsection 47A(1) is a needlessly intrusive 'status' offence dating back to the old Vagrancy Acts and the Poor laws. The following subsection 47A(2) covers the behaviour the law seeks to prevent, and is the provision that should be retained.	Repeal

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.47A(2)	'...person is loitering... and Police believe on reasonable grounds that an offence has been or is likely to be committed etc'	174	<p>This is a discretionary, preventative provision requiring the Police to believe on reasonable grounds that something bad is likely to happen if they do not do something to prevent it.</p> <p>The mental degree of conviction for 'believes' is higher than mental degree of conviction for 'suspects', and as this is a preventative provision it should be easier to use. The state of mind required by the Police should thus be 'reasonably suspects' rather than 'believes on reasonable grounds'.</p> <p>The subsections relating to obstruction, safety, and 'reasonable enjoyment of other persons using the place for the purpose...it was intended' should also remain. The language should be brought up to date with the words "cease loitering" being replaced by something people can understand. There should be a proviso added similar to the Victorian proviso which allows political or industrial demonstrations.</p>	<p>The offence of Loitering should be retained.</p> <p>The offence should be 47A(2) without 47A(1).</p> <p>'Reasonably suspects' should replace 'believes on reasonable grounds'.</p> <p>The words 'cease loitering' should be replaced by 'move on', or 'leave the place' as in the Victorian section 6, and should include the Victorian proviso allowing political or industrial demonstrations.</p>
s.47B	Loitering – Offence following Notice (72 hour bans after a notice given)	22 times in 3 years	The offence has not had time to prove its worth. Police have only recently been issued with notepads including the required notice and have been trialling them. Initial misgivings may have been unfounded.	Retain
s.55	Challenge to Fight	49	The reference to money should be removed and the offence should be the challenge or acceptance of the fight. The old fashioned use of preventing 'prize fighting' has no relevance now. Subsection (2) 'sureties for keeping the peace' is unnecessary.	Retain Amend
s.55A	Consorting between known offenders.		<p>This is part of the recent 'anti gangs' legislative package.</p> <p>There have been no prosecutions to date.</p>	Retain

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.56(1)[c]	Offences; 'wanders abroad...to beg or gather alms		This is the ' begging ' provision. The offence can criminalise people who are unable to provide for themselves. The main mischief is the public nuisance aspect which can be fixed by having a two stage provision giving police powers to move along people who are begging and making the offence 'not moving along when requested by Police' and so decriminalise the actual begging.	Amend
s.56(1)(e)	'...deleterious drug or article of disguise...'	15	Having a 'deleterious drug' is taken care of by the Misuse of Drugs Act and should be deleted. Having 'articles of disguise' without a lawful excuse should be criminalised in a simpler way. This offence should be combined into a single offence with possessing housebreaking equipment.	Retain but amend to remove 'deleterious drug'. Include 'possess housebreaking equipment'. (see 57(1)(e))
s.56(1)(i)	'...consorts with reputed criminals...'	0	The offence is now covered by s.55A SOA 'Consorting between known offenders'.	Repeal
s.57(1)(a).	Offences After Finding of Guilt; '...having been found guilty ...commits any of the offences'	0	There should not be an offence of committing a second offence. This comes from the old Vagrancy Acts. This whole section should be repealed.	Repeal
s.57(1)(b)	'solicits, gathers or collects alms...'	0	This describes different ways one can beg. We have already spoken of begging. It is covered by s.56.	Repeal
s.57(1)(d)	'pretends to tell fortunes...'	0	This is outdated and unnecessary.	Repeal
s.57(1)(e)	'...without lawful excuse...any picklock, key, crow etc'	106	'Possessing housebreaking equipment' is a fairly frequent offence. It should be included in the same section as 'possessing an article of disguise'. (see section 56(1)(e) above)	Repeal, rewrite into 56(1)(e)
s.57(1)(l)	'...being a suspected person or reputed thief , is in on or near...with intent... river canal etc ...'	0	This is a very old 'status' offence, unprovable in Court today and should be repealed. The <i>Police Administration Act</i> covers Police moving undesirables from places of entertainment etc., and this offence is outdated and unnecessary.	Repeal
s.57(1)p)	'..leaves his wife or child'	0	This is covered by other legislation such as the <i>Family Law Act 1975</i> (Cth) and should not be in the SOA.	Repeal
s.58	Penalty for second or subsequent offence...	0	There should not be a separate offence of committing a second or subsequent offence.	Repeal

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.69B	Inciting to the commission of offences	31	The offence of inciting is covered by s.43BI of the Criminal Code and s.158 of the Police Administration Act. It is unnecessary here.	Repeal
s.74	Power to Regulate Traffic in Certain Cases		The style is archaic and needs redrafting. This section is necessary for giving Police powers for regulating processions and preventing obstructions to thoroughfares.	Redraft similarly to s.59 SA. ⁴ Retain in SOA
s.75	Prohibition of Nuisances in Thoroughfares. Any person who, in any street, thoroughfare or public place....		This old and rambling section includes 'bill posting' kite flying' and depasturing goats. The main job it has is to prevent obstructions in thoroughfares. Section 6 in the NSW Act addresses the mischief in a succinct and modern way. The offence of making graffiti is also included here but graffiti needs two separate sections. One to prohibit making graffiti and another to prohibit selling spray paint cans to minors.	Redraft as per s.6 NSW ⁵ and retain in SOA.
s.76	Playing musical instruments so as to annoy		This is an offence against bad busking and is unnecessary. Objectionable noise is covered by the noise provisions.	Repeal
NOISE				
s.53A	'Undue Noise at social gathering after midnight...	7	This is self explanatory. It requires a complaint from a member of the public.	Retain
s.53B	Undue noise	20	Again this requires a complaint from the public.	Retain
s.53C	Certificate of Police Officer as evidence.		This is not an offence provision. It is a common type of averment provision, making the offence easier to establish.	Retain
s.53D	Noise abatement orders	1	A court may issue a notice directing the noise maker abate the noise if the Court is satisfied it is 'undue' noise. The process first requires a complaint from a member of the public.	Retain
s.53E	Powers of Police		Police can enter premises from which the noise is coming and ask who owns or controls it.	Retain
s.53F	Compliance with direction		After a direction has been given under the previous sections it does not matter if it is a different noise next time.	Retain
TRESPASS OFFENCES				
s. 46A	Forcible Entry	16	This is an offence to counter squatting and the potential associated disorder. It should be in the <i>Trespass Act</i> .	Move offence to <i>Trespass Act</i> .

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.46B	Forcible Detainer	0	This is a companion piece of legislation to 46A and should also be in the <i>Trespass Act</i> .	Move offence to <i>Trespass Act</i> .
DISHONESTY OFFENCES				
s.49A(1)(a)	Illegal Use of Vehicle 'interferes or tampers with any vehicle...'	1517	This offence although titled 'Illegal use' actually prohibits interfering or tampering with a vehicle. This is different from, and of a lower order of criminality than, the offence of 'Unlawful Use Motor Vehicle...' (s.218 Criminal Code).	Amend and retain. Change the title to "Interfering with motor vehicle or boat" It should include subsection 49A(1)(c) "tampers with or goes on board a boat".
s.49A(1)(b)	'works or uses any horse or other beast of burden...'	0	This is an old fashioned offence which is unnecessary.	Repeal
s.49A(1)(c)	'...tampers with or goes on board a boat...'	24	There is still a use for this subsection in the NT. It should be grouped with 47A(1)(a)	Retain
s.49A(2)	'compensation for loss or damage...'		Compensation is covered in the Sentencing Act and it is unnecessary to be repeated here.	Repeal
s.49A(2A)	'...suspend any licence...'		This is a dishonesty offence not a traffic offence. There are powers in the <i>Traffic Act</i> to suspend licences. It is confusing to have a power to suspend a traffic licence for a dishonesty offence, and that power should not rest here.	Repeal
s.54	Stealing Domestic Animals	3	This offence is a stealing offence and so is covered by s210 of the Criminal Code.	Repeal
s.60	Valueless Cheques	53	This is a deception offence relating to passing cheques when no money is in the account. It has a reversed onus of proof and the defendant must prove he or she did not intend to defraud.	Retain
s.60A	Fraud other than false pretences	4	This offence is covered by Criminal Code s.227 'Criminal Deception' and is unnecessary.	Repeal
s.61	Persons suspected of having Stolen Goods	1213	This section reverses the onus of proof, requiring someone found in possession of property believed to be stolen to give an exculpatory explanation. Most jurisdictions have a similar offence.	Retain
s.62	Where property improperly taken or stolen is found and not satisfactorily accounted for.	0	This offence is very old and would include too many innocent people in its net. It is archaic both in language and legal concepts. Section 61 covers the field.	Repeal
s.65A	Tampering with instruments	0	This offence is different to Criminal Code s.227 'Criminal Deception', and is to do with altering odometers.	Retain

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
INDECENCY and OBSCENITY				
s.50	'Indecent Exposure'	81	The language in this section is archaic and should be brought up to date.	Retain and redraft similarly to section 19 of the Victorian Act. ⁶
s.53(1)(a)(i)	Obscenity '...sings an obscene song or ballad...uses profane, indecent or obscene language...'	531	There is a lot of case law defining the meaning of 'obscene'. The word 'profane' with its religious overtones should be removed. Although using obscene/indecent language has been charged 531 times in the last 10 years, there is no place today for the archaic language in which the offence is written. The prohibition to singing obscene songs or ballads etc would impact harshly on sports teams and social clubs. This provision is not required as a new Offensive language section as recommended in s.47 SOA will cover this behaviour.	Repeal
s.53(7)(a) &(b)	'...threatening, abusive or objectionable words or behaviour...'	1693	'Objectionable words' has been charged 891 times, 'threatening behaviour' has been charged 768 times, 'objectionable behaviour' has been charged 34 times. The new section 47 SOA covers this behaviour.	Repeal
MISCELLANEOUS OFFENCES				
s.46C	Disturbing Religious Worship	3	This behaviour is covered by other sections such as s.47 SOA and by the offence of Assault (s.188 Criminal Code).	Repeal
s.52	Injuring or extinguishing Street lamps	0	This offence is covered by 'Criminal Damage' s.251 Criminal Code.	Repeal
s.65AA	Dumping of certain containers	0	This offence is to do with dumping older style self closing refrigerators that were unable to be opened from the inside. There is no need for the provision now.	Repeal
s.66	Regulation of Places of Public Resort	0	This provision is covered by the <i>Liquor Act</i> ss. 105 & 121 and should be repealed.	Repeal
s.68A	False Reports to Police	60	All jurisdictions have a similar offence.	Retain
s.68B	Advertising a Reward for the Return of Stolen Property	0	This offence seems to punish the victim. There is no reason to retain such an offence.	Repeal
s.69	Penalty for offences where no special penalty is appointed	0	When the SOA is rewritten, all the offences will have the penalties stated in the offence provision. Section 69 will then be redundant.	Repeal

Section	Offence	Charges in the Last Ten Years	Comment	Recommendation
s.69A	Disobedience to laws of the Territory	0	This was enacted at the same time as the Criminal Code and was to catch any mistakes or omissions in the new code. It is unnecessary.	Repeal
s.75A	Dangerous Dogs	71	This is a necessary offence. Local council by-laws are unsatisfactory and unenforceable. There is no Dog Act and the SOA is the best place for this offence. The penalty should remain the same at around \$5000.	Retain
s.78	Keeping clean yards	0	This offence can be dealt with by the <i>Health Act</i> , and the <i>Fire and Emergency Act</i> .	Repeal
s.82	Offences relating to public fountains	0	There is no need for this offence now. The criminal damage provisions in the Criminal Code cover this behaviour.	Repeal
s.85	Leaving dead animals in public place	3	This offence is covered by the <i>Litter Act</i> , is very old and is unnecessary.	Repeal
s.89	Cellars or openings beneath the surface of footpaths prohibited.	0	This is a very old offence. There is no need for it and it should be repealed.	Repeal
s.91AA	Regulatory offences		The SOA will be rewritten so that the criminal responsibility provisions in Part IIAA of the Criminal Code apply. Each offence will state what, if any, fault elements apply.	Repeal

Note re Graffiti

It is recommended Graffiti Offences will be covered by two new sections, one section prohibiting the making of Graffiti and the other prohibiting selling spray paint cans to minors.

Footnotes

1. SECTION 74A CRIMINAL CODE COMPILATION ACT 1913 (WA)

Disorderly behaviour in public

- (1) In this section –
- behave in a disorderly manner*** includes –
- (b) to behave in an insulting, offensive or threatening manner.
- (2) A person who behaves in a disorderly manner –
- (a) in a public place or in the sight or hearing of any person who is in a public place; or
- (b) in a police station or lock-up,
- is guilty of an offence and is liable to a fine of \$6,000.

2. SECTION 4A SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1988 (NSW)**Offensive language**

(1) A person must not use offensive language in or near, or within hearing from, a public place or a school.

Maximum penalty: 6 penalty units.

(2) It is a sufficient defence to a prosecution for an offence under this section if the defendant satisfies the court that the defendant had a reasonable excuse for conducting himself or herself in the manner alleged in the information for the offence.

3. SECTION 30 SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1981 (NZ)**Peeping or peering into dwellinghouse**

(1) Every person is liable to a fine not exceeding \$500 who is found by night without reasonable excuse –

- (a) peeping or peering into a dwellinghouse; or
- (b) loitering on any land where a dwelling house is situated

4. SECTION 59 SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1953 (SA)**Regulation of traffic in certain cases**

(1) In this section –

“special occasion” means a period during which, in the opinion of the person giving a direction under this section, a street, road or public place will be unusually crowded.

(2) The Commissioner, or the mayor or chairman of a council, may give reasonable directions, either orally or in writing, or in any other manner, for –

- (a) regulating traffic of all kinds;
- (b) preventing obstructions;
- (c) maintaining order,

in any street, road or public place on any special occasion.

(3) Any such direction –

(a) if given by the Commissioner, may apply within the whole or any part of the State;

(b) if given by the mayor or chairman of a council, may apply only within the area of the council.

(4) If a direction given by the Commissioner under this section is in conflict with a direction given by a mayor or chairman of a council, the direction of the Commissioner prevails.

(5) The Commissioner may delegate the power to give directions under this section to a senior police officer, subject to any limitations or conditions which the Commissioner thinks it proper to impose.

(6) A direction under this section must be given –

(a) by publication of the direction in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State; or

(b) in such other manner as to ensure as far as reasonably practicable that, prior to the special occasion, the direction will come to the attention of those who, by their actions or presence, are likely to cause, or contribute to, the crowding of the street, road or public place.

(7) Where a direction has been given under this section, a police officer may, upon the occurrence of the special occasion, give to any person, orally or in writing, such orders as are reasonably calculated to ensure compliance with the direction.

(8) A person who fails to comply forthwith with an order under this section is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$750.

An allegation in a complaint for an offence against this section that a direction under subsection (6) was given or published and was given or published in a particular manner is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that that direction was given or published and that it was given or published in that manner.

5. SECTION 6 SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1988 (NSW)

Obstructing traffic

A person shall not, without reasonable excuse (proof of which lies on the person), wilfully prevent, in any manner, the free passage of a person, vehicle or vessel in a public place.

6. SECTION 19 SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT 1966 (VIC)

Obscene exposure

A person must not wilfully and obscenely expose the genital area of his or her body in, or within the view of, a public place. Penalty: 2 years imprisonment.