



HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

NOTICE OF FILING

This document was filed electronically in the High Court of Australia on 04 Feb 2025 and has been accepted for filing under the *High Court Rules 2004*. Details of filing and important additional information are provided below.

Details of Filing

File Number: B11/2024
File Title: Cherry v. State of Queensland
Registry: Brisbane
Document filed: Form 27F -Int 5 (A-G SA) Outline of oral argument
Filing party: Interveners
Date filed: 04 Feb 2025

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the cover page of the document which has been accepted for filing electronically. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties and whenever the document is reproduced for use by the Court.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA
BRISBANE REGISTRY

No B11/2024

BETWEEN:

RODNEY MICHAEL CHERRY

Plaintiff

and

STATE OF QUEENSLAND

Defendant

10

**OUTLINE OF THE ORAL SUBMISSIONS OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR
THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (INTERVENING)**

Part I: PUBLICATION OF SUBMISSIONS

1. This submission is in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

Part II: OUTLINE OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS

The impugned provisions do not alter the sentence imposed on the Plaintiff

2. The setting of a minimum period of incarceration ensures that an offender gets their just deserts. It is silent on the question of whether the executive might extend leniency upon the expiration of that period. It does not confer on a prisoner a right to parole. It follows that changes to the rules that govern the availability of parole do not interfere with the setting of the non-parole period: SA, [7]-[10].

10 3. The Plaintiff’s attempt to distinguish the application of these principles in *Crump* (V3, T18), *Knight* (V4, T28) and *Minogue* (V5, T34) is formalistic: PS, [38]; SA, [11]-[14].

4. For these reasons, the Plaintiff’s challenge must fail, and it is unnecessary to consider the additional issues identified by the Plaintiff: SA, [15].

The impugned provisions do not confer judicial power on the Parole Board

5. The Plaintiff’s contention that the power conferred by the impugned provisions on the Parole Board is judicial is inconsistent with the fact that the executive branch has historically been authorised to determine when sentences imposed by courts might be mitigated by reference to a range of policy considerations. It is also inconsistent with this Court’s decision in *Minogue* (V5, T34): SA, [16]-[19].

20 **The novel defining characteristic proposed by the Plaintiff should not be accepted**

6. Whilst it may be accepted that interferences with judicial sentences may impair the institutional integrity of state courts so as to enliven the *Kable* doctrine, there is no authority to support the existence of the novel defining characteristic that the Plaintiff contends for. The decision of *Attorney-General (Qld) v Lawrence* [2014] 2 Qd R 504 (V6, T40) does not assist the Plaintiff: SA, [23]; *Lawrence*, [27], [30], [32], [33], [42].

Dated: 4 February 2025

.....

.....

30 **MJ Wait SC**
Solicitor-General for South Australia

JF Metzger
Counsel for the Attorney-General