

SUPREME COURT OF QUEENSLAND

CITATION: *Attorney-General for the State of Queensland v Doolan*
[2015] QSC 108

PARTIES: **ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF QUEENSLAND**
(applicant)
v
GEOFFREY DOOLAN
(respondent)

FILE NO/S: BS 1454 of 2013

DIVISION: Trial Division

PROCEEDING: Application

ORIGINATING COURT: Supreme Court at Brisbane

DELIVERED ON: 1 May 2015

DELIVERED AT: Brisbane

HEARING DATE: 1 May 2015

JUDGE: Ann Lyons J

ORDER: **The Court being satisfied to the requisite standard that the respondent, Geoffrey Doolan, is a serious danger to the community in the absence of an order pursuant to Division 3 of the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003*, (“the Act”) orders that:**

- (i) **The decision made by Applegarth J on 3 May 2013, that the respondent is a serious danger to the community in the absence of an order pursuant to Division 3 of the Act, be affirmed;**
- (ii) **The continuing detention order made by Applegarth J on 3 May 2013 be rescinded;**
- (iii) **The respondent be released from custody on 4 May 2015 and, from that time, be subject to the requirements in the supervision order until 4 May 2020.**

CATCHWORDS: CRIMINAL LAW – SENTENCE – SENTENCING ORDERS – ORDERS AND DECLARATIONS RELATING TO SERIOUS OR VIOLENT OFFENDERS OR DANGEROUS SEXUAL OFFENDERS – DANGEROUS SEXUAL OFFENDER – GENERALLY – where the applicant submits

an application for an annual review of a continuing detention order in relation to the respondent pursuant to s 27 of the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2004* – whether the respondent is a serious danger to the community in the absence of an order pursuant to Division 3 of the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2004* – whether the continuing detention order made on 3 May 2013 should be rescinded – whether the respondent should be released from custody on 4 May 2015 and, from that time, be subject to the requirements under a supervision order

Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2004, s 13, s 16, s 27, s 30

Attorney-General for the State of Queensland v Doolan [2013] QSC 115, cited

COUNSEL: K Philipson for the applicant
J Sharp for the respondent

SOLICITORS: G R Cooper Crown Solicitor for the applicant
Legal Aid Queensland for the respondent

ANN LYONS J:

History of the application

- [1] This is an application by the Attorney-General pursuant to s 27 of the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2004* (“the Act”) for an annual review of a continuing detention order with respect to the respondent, Geoffrey Doolan. The respondent is currently 49 years of age and was born on 3 November 1965.
- [2] On 29 April 2011, the respondent pleaded guilty and was convicted and sentenced to three years imprisonment in relation to three counts of indecent treatment of children under 16 years of age. His full time release date was 5 May 2013.
- [3] On 3 May 2013, Applegarth J ordered that he be detained in custody, pursuant to s 13(5)(a) of the Act.¹
- [4] Section 27 requires that the hearing of the first annual review must be completed within 2 years after the day the order first had effect.

The Order of 3 May 2013

- [5] Applegarth J was satisfied that the respondent was a serious danger to the community in the absence of a continuing detention order and that he should not be released into the community subject to a supervision order at that point in time. His Honour was satisfied there was a high probability that a supervision order requiring the respondent to abstain

¹ *Attorney-General for the State of Queensland v Doolan* [2013] QSC 115, [106].

from alcohol would not be complied with and that there was an unacceptable risk that the respondent would reoffend soon after becoming intoxicated. His Honour noted however:

“Those circumstances may change if the respondent completes appropriate programs, gains insights into his behaviour, develops realistic plans to prevent a relapse into alcohol abuse and sexual offending and has the support to successfully implement those plans.”²

- [6] In his decision, his Honour noted that the sexual offences committed by the respondent were not at the higher end of the spectrum, but there was a need to protect members of the community from such offences. His Honour was satisfied that a supervision order, if complied with, would lower the risk of harm and the kind of harm was less serious than in many other cases of serious sexual offences.
- [7] It was also noted that the respondent’s submissions in that application made reference to the psychiatric evidence that a supervision order which required abstinence from alcohol, treatment and support would reduce the risk of future sexual offences from high to moderate-low provided the supervision order was complied with. His Honour was concerned that the critical issue was whether the supervision order was likely to be complied with and, if not, whether there was an unacceptable risk of the respondent’s reoffending before his contravention is detected.
- [8] In the circumstances that prevailed in 2013, the court was satisfied that if the respondent was to be released into the community subject to a supervision order, he was likely to abuse alcohol. It was noted that whilst it might be hoped that such consumption and contravention would be quickly detected before the respondent committed a sexual offence of the kind for which he was currently in custody, it was noted that his chronic alcoholism, his lack of insight into the causes of his offences, its consequence to the victim and his persistent past offending created a significant risk that he would become intoxicated and reoffend before his contravention could be detected. It was evident that the resumption of alcohol abuse would create a risk to the public.
- [9] His Honour considered that a continuing detention order should be made, principally so that the respondent could “receive treatment with a view to his rehabilitation”.³

Criminal history

- [10] The respondent has a criminal history which dates back to 1983. That history includes entries for over 200 offences, including breaking and entering, stealing and breaking and entering dwelling houses with intent; 48 charges that range from common assault to aggravated assault, as well as assaulting police officer, resisting police, obstructing police and one count of stalking. There are then 40 charges which relate to vagrancy, damage to property, public nuisance, as well as alcohol and drug convictions and multiple breaches of bail conditions. On 29 April 2011, he was convicted of the index offences. The victims were two brothers who had gone to the male toilets. Both boys were under 16. One was grabbed on the genital area, including pressure being applied to his testicle and the respondent exposed his testicles to the child and prevented him from leaving the toilet area. The respondent continued to touch his genitals and he rubbed his genitals on the door of the toilet.

² *Attorney-General for the State of Queensland v Doolan* [2013] QSC 115, [105].

³ *Attorney-General for the State of Queensland v Doolan* [2013] QSC 115, [106].

Sexual offences history

	Date	Offence
1	9 November 1990	Aggravated assault of a 15 year old female where he kissed her and touched her breast and made suggestive comments.
2	February 1996	Conviction of wilful exposure where he appeared to be masturbating whilst standing outside a school fence in Normanton.
3	15 November 1996	Aggravated assault of a sexual nature where he grabbed a woman's right breast.
4	13 January 1998	Conviction of wilful exposure by way of exposing his penis to an eight year old girl.
5	7 April 2000	Indecent treatment of children under 16; two victims, 12 and 13, were approached near a cinema. The respondent grabbed the leg of one of them and touched the other on the genitals outside her clothing.
6	18 July 2001	Conviction of indecent assault of a 23 year old woman who he grabbed on the thigh and touched her genitals and indicated he wanted to have sex with her.
7	29 December 2003	Conviction of common assault of a 16 year old girl. He approached the girl and held her. There was an intervention but the act was then repeated.
8	15 November 2005 20 November 2005	Conviction of sexual assault of two separate victims. On the first occasion, he put his arms around a woman and kissed her on the cheek and made requests for oral sex. The second was on a shop assistant to whom he put his arms around and made suggestions.
9	1 April 2006	Conviction of unlawful stalking of a female.
10	1 November 2006	Conviction of indecent treatment of children under 16 including a 14 year old girl who had been waiting at a bus stop. She was approached by the respondent and asked for sex. When she refused, he grabbed her by the arm, kissed her on the cheek and then kissed her on the lips as she tried to get away.
11	2 May 2008	Conviction of sexual assaults occurring on 22 August 2007.
12	29 April 2011	Conviction of the index offences.

Progress in custody

- [11] On 10 December 2012, the STATIC 99R assessed him as a high risk of sexual recidivism compared to the normative sample. The respondent then completed the Getting Started: Preparatory Program at the Townsville Correctional Centre on 25 September 2013. In the Completion Report for that Program, the report noted that at that point in time he had

demonstrated no insight into his sexual offending and accepted limited responsibility for the offending and demonstrated limited general empathy and empathy for his victims. It also noted he was unwilling to explore his sexual offending behaviour and had no motivation to engage in intervention. The respondent suffered a stroke in July 2011.

- [12] The respondent has been breached in custody on five occasions since 21 November 2012 for acting in an indecent or offensive way in another person's presence, making a threat to a supervisor, using abusive, indecent or offensive language, wilful destruction of property, contravening a lawful direction, and assaulting another prisoner. That assault involved throwing a cup of tea onto another prisoner who was vulnerable. The respondent has an extensive violation history going back to 1983. His most serious offences were committing grievous bodily harm in November 2005, assault in 2006, sexual assault in 2007, and another assault in 2008. He is noted to have an ongoing propensity to act impulsively and he has a history of non-compliant, abusive and assaultive behaviour.
- [13] He has completed a number of programs in custody, including the Transitions Program in 2012, a Vocational Training Program in 2012, and a Turning Point Preparatory Program in 2012.
- [14] Since the order of Applegarth J of 3 May 2013, ordering that he be detained in custody pursuant to s 13(5)(a) of the Act, he has participated in the sexual offending program for indigenous males ("SOPIM") at the Lotus Glen Correctional Centre. I also note that the SOPIM completion report is dated 17 March 2015 and it records that between 20 January 2014 and 10 February 2015 the respondent completed 120 sessions which described steady improvement as well as areas that required significant ongoing work. The report indicates that not only was there steady improvement over time but that he engaged consistently with participants and facilitators. It was also noted that there was increased motivation and better management of mood and impulsivity. The report noted that when his offences were discussed, he could explain why his actions were inappropriate.
- [15] He has now been examined and assessed by two psychiatrists, Dr Josephine Sundin and Dr Scott Harden, for the purpose of this annual review of the continuing detention order. Both psychiatrists consider that the respondent has made significant gains as a result of the SOPIM and that given those improvements he could now be managed in the community pursuant to a supervision order if rigorous conditions were put in place.

Dr Harden's report dated 15 April 2015

- [16] Dr Harden indicated that the respondent was not interested in the interview and provided minimal responses. It would seem that he refused to engage in the interview, telling Dr Harden he had few sexual thoughts and denied masturbating in prison. Whilst he was adamant with Dr Harden that he would stay off alcohol, Dr Harden noted his inability to do so previously. He refused to discuss his disciplinary breaches. Dr Harden indicated that the respondent stated he had a stroke in 2012 and the medical records indicated that he had had a haemorrhage secondary to an artery aneurism rupture. He has had no visitors or contact with family. He indicated a desire to go to a TAFE college and to become a mechanic if possible. He understood that if he resumed drinking, he would be breaching a supervision order and returned to custody.
- [17] Dr Harden noted an unrealistic expectation in relation to his ability to resist alcohol in the community. Dr Harden noted the respondent's life was characterised by a lack of

emotional connection to other people and severe alcohol abuse. He had a complete disregard for the rights of other people and whilst his institutional behaviour was reasonable, it was clear that he saw no difficulty in being threatening or difficult if that suited his purpose.

- [18] Dr Harden considered the respondent met the criteria for anti-social personality disorder as well as meeting a diagnosis of alcohol abuse in remission.
- [19] Dr Harden considered that the actuarial and his professional judgment measures indicated that the respondent's future risk of sexual offence was high. He also considered he was an extremely high risk of sexual assault if returned to the community with no modifying factors, the critical issue being alcohol abuse. If he was not intoxicated, he considered the risk would drop from high to moderate. He considered, however, that it was very likely that the respondent would immediately return to alcohol use on his release and that quite soon he would approach young people in a public place and attempt to touch them sexually. Dr Harden indicated that pattern had occurred so many times that it was very unlikely that it would change without substantial external modifiers, such as those found in a supervision order. He considered the highest risk would be if he were to be intoxicated with alcohol in a situation where he could access young people, particularly in their early to mid-teens.

Recommendations of Dr Harden

- [20] Dr Harden considered that if the respondent was released from detention, he should be monitored in the community by means of a supervision order. He noted his difficulties are longstanding and would be unlikely to resolve quickly and any order should be in place for five years. He recommended that he be required to be abstinent from alcohol and drugs and undergo routine testing.
- [21] Dr Harden also recommended that the respondent participate in ongoing individual therapy for sex offenders and substance abuse treatment, and that individual therapy was more likely to be successful if it focussed on those things that were in his interests. Dr Harden considered that if the respondent were to breach the supervision order by using alcohol, he should be re-incarcerated immediately. His view was that the respondent's long term prognosis was still poor, but there were grounds to cautiously trial some time in the community under a high degree of supervision.

Dr Sundin's report dated 20 April 2015

- [22] Dr Sundin noted that the respondent had difficulty as a historian. She indicated, however, that he was able to discuss the program he had done, namely the SOPIM and that he had learnt a lot of things from it. In particular, not to touch women and to stay away from alcohol and drugs and from friends who are using drugs. Dr Sundin notes that the respondent now recognises that in order to stay out of jail, he knows he must not touch women. He also advised Dr Sundin that he wanted to attend a men's group in the indigenous community and to attend alcohol and drug groups. When he discussed his plans with Dr Sundin, he was able to elaborate in more detail what his plans were particularly in relation to his placement in contingency housing at Townsville. He stated that he had plans to live in Townsville and had lived there before. He also acknowledged he had behaved in an intoxicated way in the Townsville Mall before and had been

convicted of breaches at the Mall but he did not perceive that he would have any difficulty spending his time in the Mall, indicating he would not do anything stupid.

- [23] He also indicated that whilst he wanted to have a relationship with a girlfriend he was not certain how he could do this, given his view that “you can’t trust women these days. They’ll set you up for rape.” Dr Sundin indicated that the respondent was able to reflect on his past sexual offences. He also described methods as to how he would cope if he had increased sexual thoughts. He also indicated that he had developed some strategies during his participation in the SOPIM course to assist with anger management, including the stop, think and walk away strategies. Dr Sundin stated that he also indicated that he did not wish to go to jail again and that in order to stay out of jail in future, he intended to be compliant with directions. He also indicated that he had made a great effort to be courteous in his behaviour towards corrections staff in 2015. He reiterated to Dr Sundin that he wanted to do a TAFE course but that he would be in receipt of a Disability Support Pension given he had injuries in his right shoulder and leg. He was also hopeful of ultimately returning to Doomadgee where his sister’s children and grandchildren lived.
- [24] Dr Sundin considered that the respondent had a solid if simplistic understanding of the lessons he had learnt in the SOPIM course and had understood some of the management strategies being taught to prevent him from acting impulsively. He also had an awareness of the importance of abstinence from alcohol and appreciated that any breach would lead to a return to prison. She noted, however, that he had a low frustration tolerance and proclivity to impulsivity within prison.
- [25] Dr Sundin considered the respondent’s primary difficulties related to his vulnerability to consuming intoxicating substances and then acting on sexual preoccupations and whilst he denied any preoccupation with pre-pubescent females, she considered he had an ongoing preoccupation with women but appeared to learn that girls under 18 were taboo.
- [26] Dr Sundin considered that her diagnosis with regard to the respondent was unchanged from her previous report in 2012 where she considered that he met the DSM-4 criteria for (a) alcohol abuse/dependence in sustained remission in prison; (b) cannabis abuse in remission (c) mixed personality disorder with anti-social and avoidance traits; (d) possible cognitive impairment secondary to past heavy alcohol abuse; and (e) paedophilia non-exclusive type attracted to males and females.
- [27] Dr Sundin considered that the respondent’s risk in 2012 was moderate to high for future sexual recidivism and a high risk for future violent recidivism and a high risk for general criminality. She considered, however, that the risk had improved in the areas of insight, awareness of consequences and preparedness to comply with supervision.
- [28] In 2012, Dr Sundin considered that the respondent represented a significant risk to the community based on a persistent nature of his violent and sexual offending and a lengthy and extensive history of alcohol abuse.
- [29] In 2015, she considered those risk factors were the same but that on a clinical and risk management scale the situation had improved. She considered that given his risk assessment had improved in the areas of insight, awareness of consequences, and preparedness to comply with supervision, the combined results of the STATIC 99R, and the STABLE 2007 indicated that the respondent was a person who will be a high supervision priority in the community.

- [30] Dr Sundin noted, however, that he had been subjected to a significant sanction when he was not released from prison in 2012 and that that was a significant factor for him. He also participated in the SOPIM and had an adequate exit report. Dr Sundin considers that the combination of those two events appeared to have helped him begin to understand the necessity for compliance with supervision requirements and the inappropriateness of his previous behaviour. Dr Sundin considered that he appreciated that any breach of his supervision order was likely to result in immediate action.
- [31] Dr Sundin also noted that during his time in prison the respondent had had a prolonged abstinence from alcohol which had benefited his cerebral and cognitive function and he appeared to have improved his capacity to understand the need for abstinence outside of prison. Dr Sundin also noted he had aged in prison which in itself provided a degree of maturity and diminution of impulsivity. Dr Sundin considered the offences were impulsive and associated with sexual preoccupation occurring when he was intoxicated with alcohol. The report noted that there had been no abusive or threatening language since 15 November 2014.
- [32] Taken globally, Dr Sundin considered that the respondent represented an unmodified moderate to high risk for sexually violent recidivism but the risks for recidivism could be significantly moderated by a community supervision order and the requirement for absolute abstinence from any mood altering substance, particularly alcohol, cannabis or any cannabis like substance.
- [33] Dr Sundin also indicated that an important part of the risk management would be a zero tolerance for any breach of his conditions in relation to intoxicating substances.
- [34] Dr Sundin also recommended that the respondent have a male case manager within the community and that he readily have the consequences of non-compliance reiterated to him. She also stated that linkage to indigenous community support would be helpful and that any increase in anti-authoritarian attitudes or verbal aggression would need to be responded to promptly.

Other evidence of management of risk in the community

- [35] Cassandra Cowie, the Acting Manager of the High Risk Offender Management Unit (“HROMU”), has provided an affidavit which states that HROMU is involved in overseeing the supervision and surveillance of offenders on supervision orders. She advised that contingency accommodation was available at Townsville to persons released to supervision orders under the Act who have no suitable alternative accommodation at the time of release. The accommodation is provided for an initial three month period and is subject to review thereafter. When the respondent provides some future suitable accommodation, Queensland Corrective Services (“QCS”) will conduct an assessment. Ms Cowie indicated that there would be accommodation for the respondent at the Townsville Precinct from 4 May 2015 and he would be expected to actively source long-term accommodation whilst at that facility.
- [36] Ms Cowie states that Dr Robert Walkley, psychologist, has been engaged by QCS to provide treatment and psychological intervention to the respondent and his first session is scheduled for Tuesday 12 May 2015. She stated that QCS also requires that treatment is to be provided in consultation with QCS and in consideration of the psychiatric and psychological reports currently available. She stated that QCS will also liaise with Dr

Walkley regarding the nature and effectiveness of treatment and if the respondent is in the community, referrals to other relevant service providers will be considered as necessary. The frequency of treatment sessions depends on the respondent's needs and will be determined by Dr Walkley in consultation with QCS.

- [37] Ms Cowie also indicated the respondent would be referred to the Townsville Indigenous Mentoring Program which is run by an Aboriginal Elder who provides cultural support to released offenders. As well as the one-on-one program, there is an Indigenous Men's Group which will allow the respondent to meet others and explore his cultural needs. He will also be referred to the Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drugs Service ("ATODS") in Townsville which offers individual counselling, as well as substance abuse programs aimed at assisting in abstinence from alcohol and substances. The respondent will also be referred for assessment to participate in the Salvation Army Bridge Program, which is an abstinence based program and offers one-on-one support group therapy and work therapy.
- [38] Ms Cowie indicated that there was no evidence that the respondent had held any ongoing hostility towards the victims and he was openly discussing his offending. He could explain why his actions were inappropriate.

What orders should be made pursuant to s 30 of the Act?

- [39] The power of the court to make orders upon review are set out in s 30 of the Act which provides as follows:

"30 Review hearing

- (1) This section applies if, on the hearing of a review under section 27 or 28 and having regard to the required matters, the court affirms a decision that the prisoner is a serious danger to the community in the absence of a division 3 order.
- (2) On the hearing of the review, the court may affirm the decision only if it is satisfied—
 - (a) by acceptable, cogent evidence; and
 - (b) to a high degree of probability;
 that the evidence is of sufficient weight to affirm the decision.
- (3) If the court affirms the decision, the court may order that the prisoner—
 - (a) continue to be subject to the continuing detention order; or
 - (b) be released from custody subject to a supervision order.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order under subsection (3)(a) or (b)—
 - (a) the paramount consideration is to be the need to ensure adequate protection of the community; and
 - (b) the court must consider whether—
 - (i) adequate protection of the community can be reasonably and practicably managed by a supervision order; and

- (ii) requirements under section 16 can be reasonably and practicably managed by corrective services officers.
- (5) If the court does not make the order under subsection (3)(a), the court must rescind the continuing detention order.
- (6) In this section—
 - required matters means all of the following—
 - (a) the matters mentioned in section 13(4);
 - (b) any report produced under section 28A.”

- [40] The question is whether, having regard to the 'required matters', the court affirms the decision that the prisoner is a serious danger to the community in the absence of a Division 3 order: s 30(1) of the Act. The required matters are those matters set out in s 13(4) and any report furnished pursuant to s 28A of the Act (a report prepared by the Attorney-General under s 8A).
- [41] The court must be satisfied pursuant to s 30(2) by acceptable cogent evidence to a high degree of probability that the evidence is of sufficient weight to affirm the decision. Counsel for the respondent concedes that the court would be satisfied that the respondent is a serious danger to the community in the absence of a Division 3 order and that the order of Applegarth J of 3 May 2013 should be affirmed in this respect.
- [42] Having considered all of the matters I am required to take into account, pursuant to s 13(4) of the Act, I am satisfied that the decision of Applegarth of 3 May 2013 should be affirmed.
- [43] The real question before this court is whether the respondent should be subject to a continuing detention order or be released from custody subject to a supervision order. Section 34 of the Act provides that in deciding whether to make a continuing detention order or a supervision order, the paramount consideration is the need to ensure the adequate protection of the community, and the court is required to consider whether adequate protection of the community can be reasonably and practicably managed by a supervision order, and whether the requirements under s 16 can be reasonably and practicably managed by Corrective Services. The requirements under s 16 relate to reporting requirements and compliance. Counsel for the applicant now concedes that the psychiatric evidence supports a finding that the adequate protection of the community can reasonably and practicably be managed by Corrective Services under a supervision order in the terms proposed in the draft. That submission is based on the reports of Dr Harden and Dr Sundin who have both indicated that the respondent has made significant progress during the treatment program.
- [44] In all of the circumstances, having considered the reports of the two psychiatrists who have been appointed and the other matters referred to in s 13(4) of the Act, which includes the respondent's pattern of offending and his efforts to address the causes of his offending behaviour, including participating in rehabilitation programs, I am satisfied that the evidence supports a finding that the adequate protection of the community can reasonably and practicably be managed by the Supervision Order. However, there must be strict adherence to the terms of the order, particularly in relation to alcohol and substance use.

I note that it is proposed that he be released on Monday, 4 May 2015, to enable arrangements to be made for him.

- [45] I am satisfied that the conditions of the proposed Supervision Order which have been provided to me will adequately address the protection of the community.

SUPERVISION ORDER

The Court being satisfied to the requisite standard that the respondent, Geoffrey Doolan, is a serious danger to the community in the absence of an order pursuant to Division 3 of the *Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003* (“the Act”) orders that:

- (i) The decision made by Applegarth J on 3 May 2013, that the respondent is a serious danger to the community in the absence of an order pursuant to Division 3 of the Act, be affirmed;
- (ii) The continuing detention order made by Applegarth J on 3 May 2013 be rescinded;
- (iii) The respondent be released from custody on 4 May 2015 and, from that time, be subject to the following requirements until 4 May 2020:

The respondent must:

General terms

- 1 report to a Corrective Services officer at the Townsville Precinct by 4pm on 4 May 2015 and advise the officer of his current name and address;
- 2 report to, and receive visits from, a Corrective Services officer at such times and frequency as determined by Queensland Corrective Services;
- 3 notify a corrective services officer of every change of his name, place of residence or employment at least two business days before the change happens;
- 4 be under the supervision of a Corrective Services officer;
- 5 comply with a curfew direction or monitoring direction;
- 6 comply with any reasonable direction under section 16B of the Act given to the prisoner;
- 7 comply with every reasonable direction of a corrective services officer that is not directly inconsistent with a requirement of the order;
- 8 not leave or stay out of Queensland without the permission of a Corrective Services officer;
- 9 not commit an offence of a sexual nature during the period of the order;

Employment

- 10 seek permission and obtain approval from a Corrective Services officer prior to entering into an employment agreement or engaging in volunteer work or paid or unpaid employment;

Residence

- 11 reside at a place within the State of Queensland as approved by a Corrective Services officer by way of a suitability assessment and obtain written approval prior to any change of residence;
- 12 if this accommodation is of a temporary or contingency nature, you must comply with any regulations or rules in place at this accommodation and demonstrate reasonable efforts to secure alternative, viable long term accommodation to be assessed for suitability by Queensland Corrective Services;
- 13 not reside at a place by way of short term accommodation including overnight stays without the permission of a Corrective Services officer;

Indictable offence

- 14 not commit an indictable offence during the period of the order;

Requests for information

- 15 respond truthfully to inquiries by a Corrective Services officer about his activities, whereabouts and movements generally;

Contact with victims

- 16 not to have any direct or indirect contact with a victim of his sexual offences;

Disclosure of plans and associates

- 17 disclose to a Corrective Services officer upon request the name of each person with whom he associates and respond truthfully to requests for information from a Corrective Services officer about the nature of the association, address of the associate if known, the activities undertaken and whether the associate has knowledge of his prior offending behaviour;
- 18 submit to and discuss with a Corrective Services officer a schedule of his planned and proposed activities on a weekly basis or as otherwise directed;
- 19 if directed by a Corrective Services officer, make complete disclosure of the terms of this supervision order and the nature of his past offences

to any person as nominated by a Corrective Services officer who may contact such persons to verify that full disclosure has occurred;

Motor vehicles

- 20 notify a Corrective Services officer of the make, model, colour and registration number of any vehicle owned by or generally driven by him, whether hired or otherwise obtained for his use;

Alcohol and substances

- 21 abstain from the consumption of alcohol and illicit drugs for the duration of this order;
- 22 submit to any form of drug and alcohol testing including both random urinalysis and breath testing as directed by a Corrective Services officer;
- 23 disclose to a Corrective Services officer all prescription and over the counter medication that he obtains;
- 24 not visit premises licensed to supply or serve alcohol, without the prior written permission of a Corrective Services officer;

Treatment and counselling

- 25 attend upon and submit to assessment, treatment, and/or medical testing by a psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, counsellor or other mental health professional as directed by a Corrective Services officer at a frequency and duration which shall be recommended by the treating intervention specialist;
- 26 permit any medical, psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, counsellor or other mental health professional to disclose details of treatment, intervention and opinions relating to level of risk of re-offending and compliance with this order to Queensland Corrective Services if such a request is made for the purposes of updating or amending the supervision order and/or ensuring compliance with this order;
- 27 attend any program, course, psychologist, social worker or counsellor, in a group or individual capacity, as directed by a Corrective Services officer in consultation with treating medical, psychiatric, psychological or other mental health practitioners where appropriate;

Contact with children

- 28 not establish or maintain any supervised or unsupervised contact including undertaking any care of children under 16 years of age except with prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer. The

respondent is required to fully disclose the terms of the order and nature of offences to the guardians and caregivers of the children before any such contact can take place; Queensland Corrective Services may disclose information pertaining to the offender to guardians or caregivers and external agencies (i.e. Department of Communities (Child Safety Services)) in the interests of ensuring the safety of the children;

Attendance at places

- 29 not without reasonable excuse be within 100 metres of schools or child care centres without the prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer;
- 30 not to access school or child care centre at any time without the prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer;
- 31 not visit public parks without the prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer;
- 32 not be on the premises of any shopping centre, without reasonable excuse, between 8am to 9.30am and between 2.30pm and 4.30pm on school days other than for the purpose of:
 - a. approved employment;
 - b. attending an approved bona fide pre-arranged appointment with a Government agency, medical practitioner or the like;
 without the prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer;
- 33 not join, affiliate with, attend on the premises of or attend at the activities carried on by any club or organisation in respect of which there are reasonable grounds for believing there is either child membership or child participation without the prior written approval of a Corrective Services officer;

Devices

- 34 allow any other device including a telephone or camera to be randomly examined. If applicable, account details and/or phone bills are to be provided upon request of a Corrective Services officer;
- 35 to advise a Corrective Services officer of the make, model and telephone number of any mobile telephone owned, possessed or regularly utilised by him within 24 hours of connection or commencement of use and includes reporting any changes to mobile telephone details.