IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA PERTH REGISTRY

No. P49 of 2019

BETWEEN:

TSM (a child)

Appellant

and

HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA
FILED
18 DEC 2019
THE REGISTRY PERTH

THE STATE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Respondent

APPELLANT'S REPLY

Part I:

1. These submissions are in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

Part II:

20

10

- 2. The State contends that Beech JA's construction detracts from the primacy of the 'acts or omissions' insofar as the definition of what is called an offence is concerned.
- 3. To the contrary, such a construction highlights that there are two essential constituents of 'an offence'. Firstly, the acts or omissions described in the various offence creating provisions in the Code. Second, that the relevant acts or omissions must also render the person who did the acts or made the omissions 'liable to punishment'. Section 2 of the *Criminal Code* (WA) (the Code) places no primacy in one essential constituent of 'an offence' over the other.

30

The Defence Lawyers Unit 48, 13-15 Cantonment Street FREMANTLE WA 6160 Telephone: 0423 347 037

Fax: 08 6230 2231

Email: nick@thedefencelawyers.com

Ref: Nicholas Terry

4. R v Barlow [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1 does not support a construction that requires the principal's act or omission to be considered divorced from the principal's criminal responsibility.

5. In the context of section 8 of the Code, the plurality in *R v Barlow* [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1 at 10 explained that liability for the principal offender's act or omission only arises for the secondary offender as (1) that act or omission renders the principal liable to punishment and (2) only to the extent that that act or omission was a probable consequence of prosecuting a common unlawful purpose.

6. In any event, no issue as to the criminal responsibility of the principal offender arose for consideration in *R v Barlow* [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1.

- 7. Further, the State contends that Beech JA's construction renders superfluous section 7(a) of the Code.
- 8. To the contrary, section 7(a) of the Code has work to do where two offenders act in concert to collectively do the acts or make the omissions which constitute the offence.
- 9. In such a circumstance, section 7(a) of the Code provides that each of the two offenders acting in concert would only be deemed to be guilty of the offence where the acts or omissions done collectively constitute the offence, and when an offence has been committed.
- 20 10. Section 7(a) of the Code would therefore be as essential within Beech JA's construction as sections 7(b), (c) and (d) and 8 of the Code.

Dated: 18 12 19

10

Name: Mara Barone SC

Telephone: (08) 9220 0491

Facsimile: (08) 6230 2231

Email: mbarone@francisburt.com.au