

Aggravated Burglary – Home Invasions

s 401 *Criminal Code*

From 1 January 2021

Transitional Sentencing Provisions: This table is divided into thirds based on the three relevant periods of Sentencing Provisions:

- Post-transitional provisions period
- Transitional provisions period
- Pre-transitional provisions period

These periods are separated by a row which shows when the transitional provisions were enacted, and another showing when they were repealed.

Glossary:

agg	aggravated
att	attempted
AOBH	assault occasioning bodily harm
burg	burglary
CBO	community based order
CSIO	conditional suspended imprisonment order
conc	concurrent
cum	cumulative
ct	count
EFP	eligible for parole
imp	imprisonment
PG	plead guilty
TES	total effective sentence
VRO/RO	violence restraining order/restraining order
wiss	with intent to sell or supply
YCRO	Youth Conditional Release Order

No.	Case	Antecedents	Summary/Facts	Sentence	Appeal
17.	<p><i>Mackey v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2025] WASCA 120</p> <p>Delivered 12/08/2025</p>	<p>27 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after trial (cts 1–3). Convicted after PG (ct 4).</p> <p>Minor criminal history; traffic offences, numerous wilful damage and trespass offences.</p> <p>Born and raised in rural WA communities; middle of three children.</p> <p>Left school part way through year 10; completed a boilermaker apprenticeship; gainfully employed as a welder.</p> <p>Diagnosed ADHD at 10 yrs of age.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr Jones</u></p> <p><i>Jones v The State of Western Australia</i> [2024] WASCA 115</p> <p>31 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>One of four children; suffered abuse as a child.</p> <p>Left school in yr 10; obtained various trade qualifications; operated his own fabrication business.</p> <p>Diagnosed with ADHD.</p> <p>Abused alcohol and cocaine.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr French</u></p> <p>26 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Criminal history; AOBH; poss controlled weapon.</p> <p>Born and raised in WA; parents separated at 2 yrs of age; father</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg home burg. Ct 2: Agg Ass with intent to rob. Ct 3: Wilful damage. Ct 4: SMV.</p> <p>On the day of the offending Mr Jones, Mr French, and Mr Thorne were at the home of another drinking and socialising for some hours. Shortly after 10:00 pm, the group agreed to attend the victim’s property with the intent of forcibly recovering property.</p> <p>The appellant was woken by a phone call immediately prior to the offending and agreed to the meet the group at a service station to provide assistance.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u></p> <p>Around 11:00 pm, the victim, JB was awoken by the sounds of two motorcycles in the driveway of the premises in which he lived. JB got up, turned on the living room light and opened the front door. JB saw Mr Jones pacing towards him wielding a baseball bat. JB retreated into the premises. Mr Jones and the co-offenders followed JB; Mr Jones then struck JB to the head with the baseball bat.</p> <p><u>Ct 2</u></p> <p>JB eventually moved to the couch; there, Mr Jones struck him multiple times with the baseball bat. Mr Jones then demanded JB’s car keys, and threatened to kill him if he did not comply. Once in possession of JB’s keys, Mr Jones and the two co-offenders then left the building.</p> <p><u>Ct 4</u></p> <p>The appellant and the co-offenders then drove off in JB’s vehicle.</p> <p><u>Ct 3</u></p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs 8 mths imp (HS). Ct 2: 1 yr 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES: 7 yrs 2 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr Jones</u></p> <p><i>Jones v The State of Western Australia</i> [2024] WASCA 115</p> <p>Ct 1: 6 yrs 6 mths imp (HS). Ct 2: 3 yr 3 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>Served cum on a 5 yr sentence for unrelated offending.</p> <p>TES: 11 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr French</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 5 yrs 8 mths imp (HS). Ct 2: 1 yr 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES: 7 yrs 2 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr Thorne</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 5 yrs 8 mths imp (HS). Ct 2: 1 yr 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES: 7 yrs 2 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge was satisfied that Mr Jones, Mr French, and Mr Thorne attended JB’s premises with the common intention of</p>	<p>Appeal dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned the first limb of the totality principle and parity with co-offenders.</p> <p>At [55] ‘the appellant was charged with separate offences in counts 1 and 2, constituted by separate acts which occurred at separate times (albeit that the conduct charged in count 2 was immediately followed from the conduct in count 1). It is relevant to the assessment of the overall criminality involved in all of the appellant’s offending to note that his criminal responsibility arose under s 7(b), s 7(c) and s 8 of the Code rather than as a person who “actually did” the acts which constituted the offences. However, no double punishment is involved in punishing the appellant for both offences for which he is criminally responsible in that manner. The assessment of the appellant’s overall criminality properly took into account the two separate offences for which the appellant’s criminal responsibility for those offences arose [in the course of a single continuous course of conduct] did not preclude some degree of accumulation of the sentences imposed on counts 1 and 2 of the indictment.’</p> <p>At [56] ‘... the appellant willingly aided and supported Mr Jones, as his criminality moved from forcibly entering the dwelling and assaulting the complainant to using violence to steal the complainant’s car keys. The appellant was, throughout, physically present, providing support, and willing to assist further if required. The appellant’s ongoing support of Mr Jones’ conduct the subject of count 2 involved criminality going beyond his support of the earlier conduct the subject of count 1.’</p> <p>At [57] ‘in addition, in determining the appropriate total effective sentence, the trial judge was required to assess the overall criminality involved in all of the appellant’s offending. This included the offending charged in counts 3 and 4 of the indictment. Where the principle of totality comes into effect, it is of little importance how the ultimate aggregate is made up ... The trial judge’s conclusion that a total effective sentence of 7 years 2 months’ imprisonment reflected the appellant’s overall criminality for all of the offending charged in counts 1 – 4 of the indictment did not involve any error of principle and was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. Having properly reached that conclusion in the exercise of her Honour’s sentencing discretion, it was open to the trial judge to give effect to the conclusion by reducing the sentence for count 2 which she would otherwise have imposed and ordering that sentence to be served cumulatively upon the sentence for count 1 while the sentences for counts 3 and 4 were to be served concurrently.’</p> <p>At [65] ‘as the trial judge appropriately recognised, the degree of criminality involved in Mr Jones’ commission of the offences charged</p>

		<p>died in a car accident at 11 yrs of age.</p> <p>Left school in yr 11; worked as a tyre fitter.</p> <p>One young child with autism; married at time of sentencing.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — Mr Thorne</u></p> <p>26 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Born in Victoria; spent childhood in Queensland; family later moved to WA; stable upbringing.</p> <p>Completed year 12; qualified carpenter; worked in the mining industry.</p> <p>Abused alcohol and cocaine.</p>	<p>During the incident, numerous glass windows of the residence were smashed, as well as the rear window of another occupant's vehicle.</p>	<p>assaulting and threatening someone, if necessary. The appellant had joined this common intention by the time he entered the complainant's premises. Mr Jones was the instigator of the enterprise, with the co-offenders acting as willing participants.</p> <p>The trial judge could not make a finding as to who damaged the vehicle, but found the conduct was a probable consequence of the common purpose for which the offenders were equally responsible.</p> <p>The trial judge found that the appellant was not a party to any discussions that occurred prior to his attendance at the service station; however, he was willing to do the bidding of Mr Jones with limited information.</p>	<p>in the current indictment was greater than the appellant's. Mr Jones was the instigator of the offending and was one of the persons who assaulted the complainant. The appellant's antecedents were better than those of Mr Jones. Other things being equal, it would be expected that the appellant would receive a lower sentence than Mr Jones for the same offences in the current indictment of which they had both been convicted.</p> <p>At [66] 'however, other things were not equal as between Mr Jones and the appellant. The significant difference was that Mr Jones was already serving a sentence of 5 years' immediate imprisonment when he was sentenced for the offences charged in the current indictment.'</p> <p>At [67] 'the present case is one where the overall total effective sentences imposed on Mr Jones and the appellant provide a more meaningful comparator than the sentences for the offences charged in the current indictment ... The overall total effective sentence received by Mr Jones was 4 years 2 months longer than that received by the appellant. That difference appropriately reflects Mr Jones' commission of the grievous bodily harm offence, his greater criminality in committing the offences charged in the current indictment, his less favourable antecedents and the application of the totality principle.'</p> <p>At [68] 'we do not accept the appellant's submission to the effect that the criminality involved in his offending was less than that involved in the offending by Mr French and Mr Thorne ... The roles of each in the offending were the same, and each of Mr French, Mr Thorne and the appellant formed or joined in the unlawful common purpose less than an hour before the offending began.'</p> <p>At [71] 'the antecedents of the appellant, Mr French and Mr Thorne were broadly similar, and the relatively minor differences between them tended to cancel each other out.'</p> <p>At [73] 'having regard to all of the circumstances of the case, the lack of difference in the sentences imposed on the appellant and on Mr French and Mr Thorne did not give rise to a legitimate or justifiable sense of grievance, nor give the appearance in the mind of an objective observer that justice has not been done.'</p>
16.	<p><i>Brockman v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2025] WASCA 40</p> <p>Delivered 20/03/2025</p>	<p>45 yrs at time offending. 47 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (15% discount).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; 26 convictions for drug offences and multiple burglary offences; three prior convictions for agg home burglary.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg home burg. Ct 2: Stealing. Ct 3: Agg home burg. Ct 4: Agg armed robbery. Ct 5: Dep lib.</p> <p><u>Cts 1 and 2</u></p> <p>The appellant and a co-offender entered</p>	<p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 6 yrs 4 mths imp (HS). Ct 4: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 5: 12 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES: 9 yrs 4 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the offending</p>	<p>Appeal allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned parity between co-offenders' sentences.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 6 yrs 10 mths imp (HS). Ct 4: 3 yrs 10 mths imp (conc). Ct 5: 2 mths imp (cum).</p>

		<p>Had a good upbringing; one of five siblings.</p> <p>Completed yr 10 and was literate and numerate; employed as a labourer during adulthood; currently unemployed.</p> <p>Stable relationship for over 20 yrs; three children with current partner; four adult children by previous relationships.</p> <p>Alcohol and cannabis use from 16 yrs of age; methyl use from 24 yrs of age</p> <p><u>Co-offender — ‘GB’</u></p> <p>36 yrs at time offending. 37 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (10% discount)</p> <p>Good upbringing until 13 yrs of age; victim of sexual abuse; father passed at 13 years of age.</p> <p>Methyl user from 16 yrs of age.</p> <p>Significant criminal history.</p>	<p>a property, forcing entry via the rear door, and stole approximately \$13,180 worth of property while causing damage searching for valuable items.</p> <p><u>Cts 3–5:</u></p> <p>On the same day as the offending on cts 1 and 2, the appellant and a co-offender attended a property with the intent to commit a burglary.</p> <p>An occupant was asleep on the couch in the lounge room. The offenders gained entry and conducted a search of the house. The co-offender located a double-barrelled shotgun. The co-offender woke the occupant, began yelling at him and pointing the shotgun in his face. The offenders made demands for valuables.</p> <p>The appellant used a belt to bind the occupant’s wrists and duct-taped the occupant’s wrists above the belt. The offenders took turns searching the house and watching the occupant while holding the shotgun. This continued for about one hour. During a struggle, the co-offender used the shotgun to strike the occupant in the head, the shotgun was also used to hit the occupant over his right shoulder.</p>	<p>the subject of counts 1 and 2 was planned and consistent.</p> <p>The offending the subject of counts 3–5 was characterised as very serious examples of aggravated burglary, robbery and deprivation of liberty offences.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the risk of future offending in a violent manner was moderate.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant had shown victim empathy and was remorseful for his offending.</p> <p>The offending had a significant impact on the occupant and his family, some of the occupant’s injuries will progressively worsen.</p> <p><u>Co-offender — ‘GB’</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 6 yrs 10 mths imp (HS). Ct 4: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 5: 12 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES: 9 yrs 10 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that there was a need for personal deterrence, as demonstrated by the continuous disobedience of the law.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the risk of future offending in a violent manner was high.</p> <p>GB lacked any victim empathy or insight.</p>	<p>TES: 9 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [24] ‘the primary judge found that the appellant and GB were “equally culpable in the offending behaviour” the subject of counts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.’</p> <p>At [27] ‘the appellant had five previous convictions for home burglary ... He was therefore a repeat offender and subject to a mandatory minimum penalty of 2 years’ immediate imprisonment for each of count 1 and count 3.’</p> <p>At [29] ‘GB was not a repeat offender, but he had one previous conviction for home burglary and two previous convictions for burglary of a place.’</p> <p>At [31] ‘... neither the appellant nor GB was of prior good character.’</p> <p>At [62] ‘where two offenders are to be sentenced for multiple joint offences, including at least a home burglary offence and an offence that is not a home burglary, and one offender (but not the other) is a “repeat offender”, as defined in s 401B of the Code, the repeat offender status of the offender who is a repeat offender is relevant: (a) in fixing the individual sentence for that offender on the home burglary offence; and (b) in applying the parity principle, as between that offender and the co-offender, in relation to the home burglary offence.’</p> <p>At [69] ‘as to count 1 ... The appellant’s complaint about the individual sentences for count 1 is without merit. In my opinion, her Honour’s imposition of the same sentence on the appellant and GB for count 1 properly reflected all relevant sentencing factors applicable to the appellant and GB, including their equal culpability for the offending behaviour the subject of count 1. The individual sentences for count 1 synthesised appropriately the appellant’s status as a repeat offender, on the one hand, and the appellant’s more significant mitigation on the other ...’</p> <p>At [70] ‘as to count 3 ... In my opinion, the disparity in the individual sentences for count 3 did not properly reflect the equal culpability of the appellant and GB for the offending behaviour the subject of count 2 and all other relevant sentencing factors. Although the disparity reflected the appellant’s more significant mitigation, the disparity was inconsistent with the appellant’s status as a repeat offender, in the context of all the relevant sentencing factors. The disparity for count 3 was erroneously favourable to the appellant.</p> <p>At [71] ‘as to count 4 ... the absence of any disparity in the individual sentences for count 4 did not properly reflect the equal culpability of</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>the appellant and GB for the offending behaviour the subject of count 4 and all other relevant sentencing factors. In particular, the absence of any disparity favourable to the appellant in the individual sentences for count 4 did not properly reflect the appellant's more significant mitigation, in the context of all relevant sentencing factors. The absence of any disparity in the individual sentences for count 4 was erroneously adverse to the appellant.'</p> <p>At [72] 'as to count 5 ... In my opinion, the absence of any disparity in the individual sentences for count 5 did not properly reflect the equal culpability of the appellant and GB for the offending behaviour ... In particular, the absence of any disparity favourable to the appellant in the individual sentences for count 5 did not properly reflect the appellant's more significant mitigation, in the context of all relevant sentencing factors.'</p>
15.	<p><i>Luckman v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 140</p> <p>Delivered 12/11/2024</p>	<p>37 yrs at time offending. 39 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial. Convicted after late PG (ct 1 22% discount; PG to alternative offence on ct 2 first day of trial).</p> <p>Minor criminal history; mostly traffic offences.</p> <p>Parents separated at 5 yrs old; raised by mother; supportive family.</p> <p>Left school at yr 11; no formal qualifications.</p> <p>Gainful employment throughout most of adult life.</p> <p>Five children; four with first wife and one with second wife; second wife was pregnant at time offending.</p> <p>Good physical health; borderline personality disorder; major depression with anxiety.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: GBH.</p> <p>On two previous occasions, the appellant and the victim, L, got into a physical altercation. On each occasion the appellant punched L to the head. A VRO was served on the appellant, which prevented him from entering L's suburb.</p> <p>Two weeks later, the appellant broke into L's property carrying a machete. The appellant struck L repeatedly with the machete while he was asleep, inflicting multiple lacerations and open fractures to L's ankle and shoulder. Other occupants of the house disarmed the appellant.</p> <p>Ct 2 was charged as GBH with intent, the appellant was found guilty of the alternative offence at trial.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 1 yr 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 7 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>TES: 9 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that without medical treatment, L would have likely suffered permanent injuries to one of the bones in his ankle and permanent muscle weakness.</p> <p>Offending had significant impact on L and the other occupants of the residence; L was still to recover from his injuries, had difficulty sleeping, and unable to return to work; L's partner experiences continuing adverse psychological, economic, and social impact.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that there was a causal link between the offending and the appellant's mental health at the time of the offences.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant was remorseful for his offending.</p> <p>The sentencing judge noted that the appellant had offered to plead guilty to the alternative offence for ct 2 more than a year before the trial.</p>	<p>Appeal allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned double punishment and first limb of totality principle.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 7 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>TES: 7 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [57] 'the proposition that underpins ground 1 is that one of the elements of the alternative offence is that the unlawful grievous bodily harm was committed in the course of an aggravated home burglary. We do not accept the correctness of this proposition.'</p> <p>At [68] '...the application of the totality principle operated such that, unless there was some additional criminality involved in count 1, the common law principle against double punishment required that the sentence for that count be wholly concurrent with the sentence for count 2.'</p> <p>At [69] 'we accept that the sentence of 7 yrs 6 mths imprisonment on the alternative to count 2 was not in error and properly reflected all relevant sentencing considerations.'</p> <p>At [70] 'in that regard, there can be no doubt that the objective seriousness of the appellant's conduct was very serious.'</p> <p>At [71] 'there were, however, a number of mitigating factors in the present case.'</p>

					<p>At [72] ‘the question which then arises is whether count 1 involved any additional criminality, such as to justify any accumulation of the sentences.’</p> <p>At [73] ‘in that regard, it is unnecessary to conduct a detailed analysis of the facts and circumstances of the two offences. It is clear that there was a very substantial, if not complete, factual overlap between them.’</p> <p>At [74] ‘...in our view, by imposing a cumulative sentence on count 1, the total effective sentence failed to reflect the overall criminality and thereby infringed the first limb of the totality principle.’</p>
14.	<p><i>Jones v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 115</p> <p>Delivered 26/09/2024</p>	<p>31 yrs at time offending. 34 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Criminal history; violent offending; bail at time offending.</p> <p>Disadvantaged childhood; taken from mother’s care at 6 yrs; sexually abused as child.</p> <p>Left school during yr 10; qualified in sheet metal fabrication; continuous work history.</p> <p>Diagnosed ADHD.</p> <p>Four children aged between 3 and 14 yrs; three different mothers; 9 yr old suffers from a significant neurological condition; oldest son in care of Department of Communities.</p> <p>Cannabis use since 11 yrs; cocaine use since 25 yrs; daily cocaine use form 29 yrs.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Agg armed robbery. Ct 3: Criminal damage. Ct 4: Steal motor vehicle.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u></p> <p>The victim, JB was awoken by the sounds of two motorcycles in the driveway of the premises in which he lived. JB got up, turned on the living room light and opened the front door. JB saw the appellant pacing towards him wielding a baseball bat. JB retreated into the premises. The appellant and the two co-offenders followed JB; the appellant then struck JB to the head with the baseball bat.</p> <p><u>Ct 2</u></p> <p>JB eventually moved to the couch; there, the appellant struck him multiple times with the baseball bat. The appellant then demanded JB’s car keys, and threatened to kill him if he did not comply. Once in possession of JB’s keys, the appellant and the two co-offenders then left the building.</p> <p><u>Ct 4</u></p> <p>The appellant and the co-offenders then drove off in JB’s vehicle.</p> <p><u>Ct 3</u></p> <p>During the incident, numerous glass windows of the residence were</p>	<p>Ct 1: 7 yrs 7 mths imp. Ct 2: 1 yr 2 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>Cum upon 5 yr sentence already being served (<i>Jones v The State of Western Australia</i> [2023] WASCA 30).</p> <p>TES: 13 yrs 9 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the offending was a home invasion motivated by revenge.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant and the co-offenders attended the premises with the common intention of assaulting and threatening someone, if necessary. JB was not the intended target of the actions of the appellant and co-offenders.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant instigated the offending, and that he escalated the violence. Accordingly, the appellant’s culpability was ‘extremely high’.</p> <p>The offending had a significant impact on the victim; embarrassment of injuries; lingering fearfulness; fears for safety upon the appellant’s release.</p>	<p>Appeal allowed (leave refused grounds 1, 2, and 3).</p> <p>Sentence appeal concerned findings of fact from the sentencing judge, length of sentence imposed on ct 1, first limb of totality principle, and cumulation of sentence.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>Ct 1: 6 yrs 6 mths imp. Ct 2: 3 yr 3 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 1 yr imp (conc). Ct 4: 2 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>Cum upon 5 yr sentence already being served (<i>Jones v The State of Western Australia</i> [2023] WASCA 30).</p> <p>TES: 11 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>At [154] ‘the appellant’s actions at the Orange Avenue premises on the night in question plainly support the impugned finding...his actions demonstrated an intention to exact some form of revenge.’</p> <p>At [163] ‘in the present case, the objective facts of the appellant’s offending on ct 1 were egregious. The appellant went to the Orange Avenue premises late at night. He was armed and in company...The appellant entered the extension by kicking the security door and one of the other men assaulted JB with weapons. The assault continued for some time. The appellant told [JB’s mother] that he would kill JB if he did not give him the keys to his vehicle. The appellant instigated the offending and escalated the violence.’</p> <p>At [164] ‘there was limited mitigation. The appellant had a disadvantaged childhood...Nevertheless, the appellant obtained a number of trade qualifications and has worked continuously since leaving school.’</p> <p>At [165] ‘...the appellant was not youthful for sentencing purposes. He</p>

			smashed, as well as the rear window of another occupant's vehicle.		<p>did not have the mitigation that a plea of guilty would have brought...The appellant was on bail for other violent offending when he committed the offending in question....'</p> <p>At [180] 'we accept that, in the present case, the sentence of 7 yrs 7 mths imp imposed on the appellant for ct 1 is towards the upper end of the range of sentences open to the trial judge on a proper exercise of her discretion.'</p> <p>At [181] 'however, in our opinion...the length of the sentence was not unreasonable or plainly unjust.'</p> <p>At [189] 'the appellant's complaint in the context of ground 3 is, in essence, that the individual sentences for cts 1 and 2 should have been ordered to be served concurrently.'</p> <p>At [190] 'there is no substance in the appellant's complaint. It was not artificial to separate the acts of violence committed by the appellant against JB into separate counts in the context of a single continuing assault.'</p> <p>At [193] 'in the present case, although cts 1, 2, 3, and 4 were committed in close temporal proximity, it was necessary to order that part of the appropriate sentence for ct 2 to be served cumulatively upon the appropriate individual sentence for ct 1 in order to ensure the total effective sentence imposed on the appellant was commensurate with the seriousness of his overall offending.'</p> <p>At [207] '...we are persuaded that the overall total effect sentence of 13 yrs 9 mths imprisonment did exceed the overall total effective sentence that was required to satisfy all relevant sentencing factors, having regard to the overall seriousness of the offending and all relevant sentencing principles.'</p>
13.	<p><i>Narkle v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 90</p> <p>Delivered 01/08/2024</p>	<p>41 yrs at time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Extensive criminal history; numerous burg and home burg offences; driving offences (subject to 12 revocations of licence); violent offences; breach of bail offences.</p> <p>Good upbringing; sixth of seven children.</p> <p>Five children from previous relationships; ages ranged from 10</p>	<p>Ct 1: Att agg home burg. Ct 2: Agg threat to kill. BU 254: Breach of bail. BU 255: Assault. BU 256: Agg assault. BU 257: Unlawful damage. BU 258: No authority to drive. BU 4674: Breach of FVRO.</p> <p>At the time of the offending, the appellant resided with his mother, M and his girlfriend, B. B was 27 weeks pregnant. There were protective bail conditions which prevented the appellant from acting in an aggressive, threatening or offensive manner towards B.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (HS). Ct 2: 6 mths imp (cum). BU 254: 12 mths imp (conc). BU 255: 6 mths imp (cum). BU 256: 10 mths imp (cum). BU 257: 5 mths imp (cum). BU 258: 3 mths imp (cum). BU 4674: 4 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES: 4 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the offending was serious, and specific deterrence was a significant matter in sentencing the appellant.</p>	<p>Appeal dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned first limb of totality principle.</p> <p>At [38] 'the overall criminality involved in all of the offending was, as the sentencing judge correctly recognised, high. It involved the appellant engaging in a prolonged unprovoked violent behaviour late at night at the victims' homes. Four victims were the subject of the offending, and a significant degree of accumulation was required to recognise the impact of the offences on each victim ... The appellant's behaviour ... was not aberrant or out of character. While it was not an aggravating factor, the appellant's past offending elevated the significance of personal deterrence and community protection in the present case.</p> <p>At [39] 'having regard to [all relevant factors] the total effective sentence of 4 yrs 6 mths immediate imprisonment imposed on the</p>

		<p>yrs to 24 yrs old; remained in relationship with B at time sentencing.</p> <p>Never worked; always relied on government allowances.</p> <p>Alcohol abuse.</p> <p>In good health.</p>	<p>After returning from a crabbing trip, the appellant, got into B's car — whilst intoxicated — and drove off (BU 258).</p> <p>While the appellant was away, B and M went to their neighbour's unit. The unit belonged to A and C. When the appellant returned, he went to the unit and asked for his house keys from B. He told B he had smashed the car.</p> <p>B went outside and saw damage to her vehicle. She then returned to A and C's unit. The appellant asked B to come outside, but B refused as she feared for her safety due to the appellant's intoxicated state.</p> <p>The appellant initially left, then later returned and attempted to enter through the screen door. He then threatened to kill B and the group (ct 2).</p> <p>The appellant then picked up a chair from outside and smashed the windows to A and C's unit (BU 257). He unsuccessfully attempted to climb through the window (ct 1).</p> <p>A went outside to confront the appellant. The appellant hit A on the check, causing him to fall to the ground (BU 256). C then went outside, and the appellant punched her to the cheek (BU 255).</p> <p>The appellant's aggressive behaviour towards B constituted the breach of bail conditions (BU 254).</p> <p>Whilst in custody, the appellant was served a FVRO. The appellant breached the FVRO by communicating with B over 500 times (BU 4674).</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found there was a significant risk of the appellant reoffending; the appellant had taken no steps to change his behaviour.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found all of the victims were vulnerable and the appellant preyed on their vulnerability.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant's chronic alcohol use and lack of employment as factors impacting on his offending.</p>	<p>appellant was not arguably unreasonable or plainly unjust. The ground has no reasonable prospect of succeeding.'</p>
12.	Clinch v The State of Western Australia [No 2]	<p>38 yrs at time offending. 40 yrs at time sentencing.</p>	<p>1 x Agg burg.</p> <p>The appellant had been in a relationship</p>	<p>4 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p>	<p>Appeal dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence.</p>

	<p>[2024] WASCA 92</p> <p>Delivered 31/07/2024</p>	<p>Convicted after PG (12% discount).</p> <p>Significant criminal history; home burg; agg home burg; disorderly conduct; AOBH; crim damage.</p> <p>Born in Carnarvon; later moved to Geraldton with his father; witnessed domestic violence; left home at 16 yrs; in regular contact with siblings.</p> <p>Attended several schools until yr 11; completed a community development program at a cattle station; later employed in the mining industry; currently unemployed and on Centrelink benefits.</p> <p>Numerous intimate relationships; five children; three in his care.</p> <p>Suffered from depression.</p> <p>Alcohol use from 14 yrs; cannabis use from 17 yrs; methyl use from late 20s.</p>	<p>with the victim for about two years, before it broke down. The appellant and the victim had been separated for about 12 months prior to the offending.</p> <p>On the day of the offending, the victim and the appellant had been communicating via text message and telephone conversations. The appellant was jealous over the victim seeing other people, and he decided to drive to her house to confront her.</p> <p>As the appellant arrived at the property, he began yelling. The victim locked the doors and moved to the back of the house. The appellant forced his way into the house through the laundry door. Once inside, the appellant found the victim, grabbed her around the jaw and pushed her against a door.</p> <p>The appellant punched the victim to her arm, shoulder and torso area whilst she was on the ground in the lounge room. He then threw his keys at the victim, hitting her on the forehead. The appellant left the house prior to police arriving a short time later.</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found that the offending was premeditated; he went to the victim's house for the purpose of finding the man she was supposedly with.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant was seeking to exercise control over his ex-partner when the relationship was over. The assault involved 'actual violence that was gratuitous, prolonged and persistent and inflicted significant pain on' the victim.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the impact of the offending was considerable. The attack occurred in the victim's home, and the behaviour was not new for the appellant.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found there was little remorse from the appellant, this was demonstrated by the later breach of bail by contacting the victim. However, the appellant had accepted some little responsibility for his actions.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found there would remain a risk of reoffending.</p>	<p>At [42] '...an aggravated home burglary committed with intent to intimidate the occupants of a house and in the course of which a serious assault committed is inherently serious. Where the occupant is a former partner of the offender the offence is a form of domestic violence. Penalties for such behaviour must reflect the seriousness of the conduct, the likely impact on the victim or victims and the importance of discouraging such conduct, both by the offender and others.'</p> <p>At [43] 'in the present case, the appellant was a mature man with a history of similar violence towards his domestic partners. There was nothing in his personal history that mitigated the offending. There was no finding of remorse and the appellant's prospects of rehabilitation were guarded.'</p> <p>At [49] 'having regard to the maximum penalty, the seriousness of the offence, the personal circumstances of the appellant and sentences imposed in comparable cases, it is not reasonably arguable that the sentence of 4 yrs immediate imprisonment imposed in this case was plainly unreasonable or unjust.'</p>
11.	<p><i>Fitzgerald v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 58</p> <p>Delivered 24/05/2024</p>	<p>44 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Significant criminal history: property damage; disorderly behaviour; assault; armed in public; obstructing police; trespass; breach of bail; burglary; fraud; stealing; possession of drugs; traffic offences; breach of community-based orders.</p> <p>Born in Perth; good relationship with parents; parents and brother are supportive.</p> <p>Completed high school; worked for 16 yrs in mining and construction.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Crim damage. Ct 3: Agg threats with intent to rob. Ct 4: Agg threats with intent to rob.</p> <p>The appellant and the victim, A, were known to each other and lived in separate units in the same complex.</p> <p><u>Cts 1 & 2</u></p> <p>Whilst A was in his own lounge room, the appellant smashed the patio sliding door and entered the unit wielding a samurai sword. The appellant demanded drugs from A, then charged at him with the sword.</p> <p>A ran and locked himself in a bedroom. The appellant followed, and repeatedly thrust the sword through the bedroom</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (HS). Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 2 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 4: 2 yrs 6 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 6 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant's criminal history required some weight to be given to specific deterrence and protection of the community.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that there was a considerable risk of the appellant re-offending if he did not access psychological assistance.</p> <p>The offending had caused A to suffer depression and feel anxious about further attacks; experience infrequent suicidal</p>	<p>Appeal dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of individual sentences and first limb of totality principle.</p> <p>At [50] 'there is no merit to the appellant's submission that the individual sentence for the aggravated burglary charged in ct 1 is manifestly excessive.'</p> <p>At [52] 'home invasions, which involve forcible entry into residential premises known or suspected to be occupied at the time, accompanied by threatened or actual violence, are generally significantly more serious than home burglaries which lack those characteristics. There has long been a recognition that sentences for home burglary need to be firmed up.'</p> <p>At [53] 'the present case involves a serious example of a home invasion burglary.'</p> <p>At [56] '...having regard to the similarity of the elements [between ss 392 and 393 offences], cases dealing with the two kinds of offences are</p>

		<p>Engaged to be married; in relationship for 10 yrs at time sentencing; adult child from previous relationship.</p> <p>Long history of substance use; cannabis from 13 yrs; other drugs to self-medicate; alcohol use.</p> <p>Sexually abused as a child; never received counselling.</p> <p>ADHD; history of depression, mood swings, and insomnia.</p>	<p>door, narrowly missing A on one occasion. The door eventually broke and A escaped the residence.</p> <p><u>Cts 3 & 4</u></p> <p>A returned to the unit with two males, R and S. The appellant was still inside A's unit with A's dog. The appellant was still holding the sword. The appellant walked towards R and S and demanded they hand over their phones. The appellant swung the sword from side to side and threatened to kill R and S if they did not hand him their mobile phones. R and S backed away, and another neighbour called the police. The appellant subsequently fled the scene.</p>	<p>thoughts; property damage has taken some time and cost to replace.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant showed little remorse for the offending.</p> <p>The appellant was attending weekly Narcotics Anonymous meetings whilst in prison.</p>	<p>likely to be broadly comparable.'</p> <p>At [57] 'this court has acknowledged that: the range of sentences commonly imposed for a single offence of armed robbery, depending upon the circumstances, was 4 to 6 yrs imprisonment. It is not unusual for a court to impose a sentence of 5 to 6 yrs imprisonment after trial for a single count of armed robbery.'</p> <p>At [59] 'the sentence of 2 yrs 6 mths' immediate imprisonment imposed for each of cts 3 and 4 falls below that commonly imposed range.'</p>
10.	<p><i>SYO v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 31</p> <p>Delivered 28/03/2024</p>	<p>38 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (25% for cts 1–3, 10% for ct 4).</p> <p>Minor criminal history; unlawful damage; breach of restraining order; agg burg; minor drug related offences; breach of violence restraining order.</p> <p>Raised by his mother; minimal involvement with his father; mother was physically abusive at times; often left home alone for days as a child; lived with grandmother from 13 yrs; unstable home; frequently saw violence perpetrated by uncles and aunts.</p> <p>Left high school at start of yr 9; completed TAFE course at 15 yrs.</p> <p>Worked in mining and construction since 14 yrs; FIFO work until voluntary separation in 2012.</p> <p>Several relationships of significance; one young daughter; most relationships marred by</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: With intent to harm, did an act which life health or safety of a person was likely to be endangered. Ct 3: Threat with intent to compel. Ct 4: Agg indecent assault. Ct 5: Stealing.</p> <p><u>Ct 1</u></p> <p>The appellant forced his way into the home of DB, a former partner. Once inside, the appellant walked into a bedroom which DB and PC were sleeping.</p> <p><u>Ct 2</u></p> <p>The appellant hit PC several times with a metal bar. The strikes were to PC's head, body, face, arms and legs. The appellant then ordered PC out of the bed and told him to move into the corner of the bedroom.</p> <p><u>Ct 3</u></p> <p>The appellant then demanded DB take off her pants. The appellant said he wanted to inspect DB's vagina to find out whether she had engaged in sexual intercourse with PC. When DB refused,</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 3 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 3: 10 mths imp (conc). Ct 4: 5 yrs 6 mths imp (HS). Ct 5: No penalty.</p> <p>TES: 9 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant had accepted responsibility for his offending, had shown some insight into its impact on his victims, and had taken positive steps to rehabilitation.</p> <p>Offending had severe impact on DB; anxiety, panic attacks, depression and PTSD; sleeplessness; felt angry, helpless, degraded and fearful from appellant's conduct.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending was principally related to the appellant's illicit drug use.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that the appellant had suffered from some dysfunction and disadvantages during childhood; however such experienced were not to be characterised as profound childhood deprivation.</p>	<p>Appeal dismissed (leave refused on grounds 2 and 3).</p> <p>Appeal concerned <i>Bugmy</i> principles, insufficient weight given to delay, and totality of sentence.</p> <p>At [66]–[72] discussion of <i>Bugmy</i> principles.</p> <p>At [70] 'it may be appropriate to distinguish between two different classes of case. The first is where profound childhood deprivation has in some way impaired the capacity of an offender to behave lawfully...The second class of case is where the offender retains full capacity to make choices about unlawful behaviour, although the poor choices which the offender makes may be influenced by childhood experience.'</p> <p>At [105] 'having reviewed the material before the sentencing judge, we agree with his Honour's conclusion that the material did not establish, on the balance of probabilities, that any relevant capacity of the appellant was impaired by profound childhood deprivation which reduced his moral culpability for the offending or diminished the significance of personal and general deterrence as sentencing considerations.'</p> <p>At [106] 'the procedural history of this matter shows the appellant experienced some delay before he was finally sentenced.'</p> <p>At [125] 'there is nothing to suggest that his Honour...did anything other than sentence the appellant according to the rules of reason and justice...and within those limits which an honest person competent to discharge the duties of his office ought to confine himself. When that is appreciated, all that is left of the appellant's submission is a contention that the sentencing judge should have given more weight to</p>

		<p>violence and drug use.</p> <p>No major history of illness or injury; testing indicated presence of antisocial personality traits.</p> <p>Used alcohol to excess from teenage yrs; cannabis use from 13 yrs; developed a methyl habit from late 20s; drug use escalated after losing his job.</p> <p>Positive personal references.</p>	<p>the appellant slapped her and raised the bar above his head as if to hit her with it.</p> <p><u>Ct 4</u></p> <p>Fearing for her life, DB complied with the appellant's demands. The appellant used one of his hands to touch DB's vagina, moving her labia majora for a short time before removing his hand. The appellant again accused DB of having sex with PC and raised the bar in a threatening manner. The appellant again touched her labia majora with his hand.</p> <p><u>Ct 5</u></p> <p>The appellant demanded DB's phone so that he could check her text messages. Before he left, the appellant took her phone with him.</p>		<p>the mitigatory effect of delay. It follows that the appellant's submissions cannot be accepted.'</p> <p>At [139] 'the offences committed by the appellant were extremely serious. The appellant entered his former partner's home without her consent, and in the very early hours of the morning, when she was asleep. .The offence charged in ct 2 was particularly serious. In what was a completely unprovoked attack by a physically powerful man, the appellant used a metal bar to repeatedly strike the much younger PC, who was initially asleep and defenceless.'</p> <p>At [143] 'in relation to ct 1, it was necessary for the sentencing judge to give effect to the need for general deterrence in relation to offences of home burglaries, particularly those that involve the use of violence...It is also equally necessary to ensure that the sentences imposed for cts 2,3 and 4 reflect the importance of general deterrence in sentencing for offences involving violence, and in relation to cts 1,3 and 4, the use of violence by men on women with whom they are, or have been, in a domestic relationships.'</p> <p>At [151] [in considering the relevant factors] 'we are of the view that it is not reasonably arguable that the total effective sentence was unreasonable or plainly unjust.'</p>
9.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v Tawhitapou</i></p> <p>[2024] WASCA 25</p> <p>Delivered 15/03/2024</p>	<p>24 yrs at time offending (IND 815). 26 yrs at time offending (IND 92). 27 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after PG (20% discount)</p> <p>Criminal history; mostly minor and traffic offences.</p> <p>Born in NZ; permanent resident status; arrived in Australia at 14 yrs old; moved to WA when he was 22 yrs old.</p> <p>Parents separated when he was 11; father abused alcohol and normalised domestic violence; grandparents raised him for some time before moving to Australia.</p>	<p><u>IND 815</u></p> <p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Stealing. Ct 3: Agg burg.</p> <p><u>IND 92</u></p> <p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Agg armed robbery. Ct 3: Agg robbery.</p> <p><u>IND 815</u></p> <p>The respondent entered through the front door of SWS's home and stole various items from the living room the kitchen and the study. SWS was at home when the offence was committed. The total value of the property stolen was about \$650 (cts 1 and 2).</p>	<p><u>IND 815</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 8 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 4 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 6 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>IND 92</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 2 yrs 2 mths (HS). Ct 3: 14 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES: 4 yrs imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge erroneously referred to the offending the subject of ct 1 as occurring when the victims were not home.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found there was limited evidence of remorse, apart from the pleas of</p>	<p>Appeal allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned first limb of totality principle and factual error in sentencing.</p> <p>Resentenced:</p> <p>15% discount.</p> <p><u>IND 815</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs 4 mths imp (conc) Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 20 mths imp (conc).</p> <p><u>IND 92</u></p> <p>Ct 1: 2 yrs 4 mths imp (conc). Ct 2: 4 yrs 10 mths (HS). Ct 3: 2 yrs 2 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES: 7 yrs imp.</p>

		<p>Attended boarding school; bullied by students; completed high school in Queensland.</p> <p>Worked as a telecommunications technician, trades assistance and scaffolder.</p> <p>Alcohol and cannabis use from early age, increased consumption of substances prior to offending.</p> <p>On and off again relationship; one child from that relationship.</p> <p>Depression and anxiety.</p>	<p>During the same night the respondent burgled another home in an adjacent suburb. The respondent and a co-offender entered CS's premises by a gate and unsuccessfully attempted to enter the house through an exterior bedroom door. The respondent and the co-offender stole two cans of soft drink from a refrigerator in an undercover alfresco area (ct 3).</p> <p><u>IND 92</u></p> <p>EEC answered a knock at the front door of her house. As she opened the door, the respondent grabbed the flyscreen door and swung it open. The respondent punched EEC to the mouth, then punched her again and grabbed her by the throat. He then put EEC in a headlock and dragged her along the hallway (ct 1).</p> <p>BG heard the commotion and came to EEC's aid. BG and the respondent grappled, and a co-offender with a knife entered the house. BG ran towards the co-offender and attempted to push him out the front door. BG and the co-offender wrestled for control of the knife, and the co-offender pushed the knife into BG.</p> <p>The respondent grabbed BG around the neck and pulled him away from the co-offender. The respondent and the co-offender kicked BG to the head. The respondent then lay on top of BG and held his shoulders, shaking him and hitting his head on the ground.</p> <p>EEC saw the assault, and went inside to call the police. The co-offender forced his way into the house, held the knife towards EEC and demanded money. EEC gave the co-offender \$200 in cash. (ct 2).</p> <p>Whilst on bail for the above offending, the respondent encountered AMT at a</p>	<p>guilty. However, the respondent was still relatively young and had taken some positive steps towards rehabilitation.</p> <p>Offending had significant impact on EEC and BG. EEC has been prescribed a high dose of antidepressant medication; resulted in the need for psychotherapy. BG has experienced depression, and the offending has exacerbated his bipolar disorder.</p>	<p>EFP.</p> <p>At [58] '...the prosecutor's reading of the material facts was erroneously transcribed as "[t]he victim wasn't home at the time of the offence" ... However, his Honour found (presumably in reliance upon the erroneous transcription) that SWS was not at home at the time of offending.'</p> <p>At [72] 'in the present case, the respondent's offending, considered as a whole, was very serious. In particular, the respondent's offending the subject of the counts in IND 92 was egregious. The gravity of the respondent's offending the subject of the counts in IND 92 is obvious. In addition...the respondent committed the aggravated robbery against AMT while he was on bail for the other offences.'</p> <p>At [73] 'denunciation of the respondent's criminality and personal and general deterrence were important sentencing considerations.'</p> <p>At [81] '...the total effective sentence of 4 years' immediate imprisonment was not commensurate with the seriousness of the respondent's offending considered as a whole.'</p> <p>At [82] 'we consider that, when the total effective sentence is viewed from the perspective of: (a) the maximum penalties for the offences; (b) the facts and circumstances of the offences considered as a whole; (c) the vulnerability of the complainants; (d) the general pattern of sentences for the offences in question; (e) the importance of denunciation and personal and general deterrence; and (f) all other relevant sentencing factors...the total effective sentence was not merely lenient or at the lower end of the available range.'</p> <p>At [83] 'the total effective sentence was substantially less than the sentence that was open to his Honour on a proper exercise of his sentencing discretion.'</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

			carpark shopping centre. The respondent and a co-offender bumped into AMT, then chased him as he began to walk away. The respondent punched AMT to his face, causing him to drop his wallet. The co-offender took the wallet. As the co-offender began to punch AMT, the respondent told him to 'get the phone'. The co-offender grabbed AMT's mobile phone and ran to his vehicle; the respondent struck AMT several more times and grabbed AMT's other mobile phone (ct 3).		
8.	<p><i>Hewins v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2023] WASCA 2</p> <p>Delivered 05/01/2023</p>	<p>20 yrs at time offending. 23 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG - cts 1-3 (3% discount). Convicted after trial (ct 4).</p> <p>Minor criminal history.</p> <p>Born UK; raised loving and supportive family.</p> <p>Educated to yr 10.</p> <p>Worked number of occupations.</p> <p>Birth of child while on bail.</p> <p>History of substance use; at time of offending under the influence of ecstasy and alcohol.</p>	<p>Cts 1 & 4: Agg burg. Ct 2: With intent to harm did an act resulting in bodily harm. Ct 3: Criminal damage.</p> <p>Mr Gornall and Mr Smith shared a house. Hewins and his brothers, Thomas, Samuel and Jacob, had visited the house.</p> <p>Hewins, his brothers, Mr Gornall and a Ms Barlett were at a nightclub. Hewins was pursuing a romantic relationship with Ms Bartlett and he became angry when he perceived that Mr Gornall and Ms Bartlett were flirting with each other. When Hewins confronted Mr Gornall and head-butting him he was evicted from the premises.</p> <p>That same evening Mr Smith was at home. He went to bed at about 11.30pm, but some hrs later he awoke to find four men in his bedroom. Three of the men physically assaulted him. Two of them punched him repeatedly while the third struck him with a baseball bat. A fourth man stood near the door of his room, pointing a gun at him. After the assault the man with the gun told him that if he said anything they would be back. The four men then left the scene in a vehicle.</p> <p>The house and some of its contents had</p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs 2 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 3: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 3 yrs imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 2 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offences 'very serious'; the appellant instigated both agg burglaries; they were premeditated and he went to the house with his brothers as 'back up', taking weapons and intending to inflict harm; he personally used violence in the first burglary in circ where he was part of a group attack upon an innocent third party and it involved the use of a weapon and in circ where a gun was pointed.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the seriousness of the appellant's conduct was not reduced by the fact he was not personally armed in either agg burglary; he knew of the existence of the weapons carried by others and that they would be used; the appellant's criminal culpability for both agg burglaries was 'extremely high'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found that despite the appellant having had the opportunity after the first agg burglary to reflect on his behaviour and conduct he went ahead and committed the second agg burglary.</p>	<p>Dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence and totality principle.</p> <p>At [57] When all of the relevant facts and circumstances are considered in respect of c 1, including all of those which are favourable to the appellant, and bearing in mind the max penalty, it cannot reasonably be contended that the sentence imposed was manifestly excessive. It was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. Implied error has not arguably been established.</p> <p>At [59] There can be no doubt that the appellant's overall criminality, having regard to the facts and circumstances of all of the offences, was very high. Having ... committed cts 1, 2 and 3, [he] and two of his brothers returned to the house later that day ... and committed another violent home burglary, terrorising Mr Gornall and those who had come to clean up after the earlier offences.</p> <p>At [60] Again, the offending was premeditated, violent and terrifying. Her Honour was correct to note that the offending the subject of ct 4 was a second separate instance of serious offending that justified some degree of accumulation.</p> <p>At [63] Having regard to the extremely serious nature of the offending, the sentence properly reflected the overall criminality of all of the offences after taking into account all relevant sentencing principles and factors, including the mitigating factors. The TES was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. Implied error has not arguably been established.</p>

			<p>been extensively damaged. The damage caused to the house cost \$20,342.84 to repair. This did not include the value of the furnishing that were damaged and not replaced.</p> <p>Mr Smith suffered bleeding and swelling to his nose, face and chest. He experienced difficulty breathing through his nose for a number of wks and migraine headaches and issues with his balance for a period of time after the incident.</p> <p>Later that afternoon Mr Gornall and Mr Smith returned home. A group of people came to help clean up. The group were sitting in the house when they heard yelling and screaming outside. Hewins and his brothers Thomas and Jacob had returned looking for Mr Gornall. They had brought with them a taser and a firearm.</p> <p>The three men entered the house through an open door. Jacob pointed a gun and told everyone if they recorded the event they would be shot. Jacob used the taser on two men. Mr Gornall and another ran from the house. Hewins pursued them. Mr Smith ran into a garage where he was further assaulted by one of Hewins' brothers.</p> <p>When interviewed by police Hewins denied going to the house and any wrongdoing.</p>	Lacked insight and victim empathy.	
7.	<p><i>Billett v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 158</p> <p>Delivered 01/12/2022</p>	<p><u>Billett</u> 27 yr at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history; prior conviction for violent offending.</p> <p>Parents separated aged 18 yrs; close relationship with mother and sister; little contact with alcoholic father, now in care suffering</p>	<p><u>Billett</u> Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Threat to harm. Ct 3: Unlawful damage. Ct 4: Agg burg. Ct 5: Act with intent to harm.</p> <p><u>Klinger</u> Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 3: Unlawful damage. Ct 4: Agg burg. Ct 6: AOBH. Ct 7: Threat to harm.</p>	<p><u>Billett</u> Cts 1 & 4: 18 mths imp (conc). Cts 2 & 5: 12 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 7 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 18 mths imp.</p> <p><u>Klinger</u> Cts 1 & 4: 18 mths imp (conc). Ct 3: 7 mths imp (conc). Cts 6 & 7: 12 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 18 mths imp.</p>	<p>Appeal allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentences cts 1, 4 and 5 and totality principle.</p> <p>Resentenced cts 1 and 4:</p> <p><u>Billett</u> Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 4 yrs 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 3 mths imp. EFP.</p>

	<p>dementia.</p> <p>Struggled at school; left yr 10; recently completed a Certificate in community services; aspires to do youth work.</p> <p>Worked intermittently; unemployed past five yrs; undertaking volunteer work.</p> <p>Two significant relationships; three children, youngest aged 12 mths at time sentencing; current partner positive and stable influence..</p> <p>Long-term history of alcohol and substance abuse; allowed access to alcohol and firearms as a child; commenced binge drinking whilst at school.</p> <p>Diagnosed with ADHD aged 8 yrs; medicated until aged 12 yrs; diagnosed and medicated with depression at 15 yrs; suffers sleep apnoea; use of cannabis to assist sleep.</p> <p><u>Klinger</u> 29 yrs time offending.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history.</p> <p>Third child of four children; father 'a big drinker'; both father and mother frequently physical and emotionally abusive; parents separated when young child; lived with his mother until moving to live with his father aged 11 yrs.</p> <p>Attended high school until yr 9; educated special school leaving yr 10.</p>	<p>Billett, Klinger and another man were socializing at a tavern.</p> <p>During the evening Billett obtained an address for a Mr Scerri. Some wks earlier there had been an incident involving him and Mr Scerri. So Billett harboured a grievance against him.</p> <p>After Billett told TL and Klinger about the incident all three decided to go together to attend the address and confront Mr Scerri.</p> <p>After driving to the address all three got out of the vehicle. Billett had with him a machete, Klinger a 15-inch tyre wall tester and TL a tomahawk.</p> <p>The house was occupied by a Mr Sorell, who was house-sitting for the owner. Mr Scerri was living in a caravan parked at the front of the premises. Billett and Klinger entered the house through an unlocked door and to a bedroom occupied by Mr Sorrell. TL remained outside, acting as a lookout.</p> <p>Billett approach Mr Sorrell, pointing the machete at him and asked for the whereabouts of Mr Scerri. Mr Sorrell told him he was in the caravan. Billett told Mr Sorrell not to move and that he was a dead man, whilst pointing the machete at him. Mr Sorrell was in fear for his life. When Billett and Klinger left the room he ran from the house, jumped a fence and hid.</p> <p>Meanwhile, Billett and Klinger ran to the caravan. They smashed windows of the caravan then forced open the caravan door.</p> <p>Mr Scerri crawled onto his bed and curled into a ball to protect himself. He felt a couple of blows and then something harder all over his body. He recognised the voice of Billett telling</p>	<p>The sentencing judge found the home burglaries serious, particularly as they involved forcible entry into premises known or suspect to be occupied and accompanied by threatened or actual violence.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending the subject of cts 1 and 4 agg by the fact the respondents were in company with each, that they knew or ought to have known the premises were occupied, they were both armed and both made threats and did harm.</p> <p><u>Billett</u> Accepting of responsibility; understanding of seriousness of offending; steps taken to change his lifestyle; maintaining abstinence from alcohol and illicit substances.</p> <p><u>Klinger</u> Significant remorse and insight into his offending.</p>	<p>Cts 1, 2, 3 and 5 conc with the sentence imposed ct 4.</p> <p><u>Klinger</u> Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 4 yrs 3 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>Cts 1, 3 6 and 7 conc with the sentence imposed ct 4.</p> <p>TES 4 yrs 3 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [57] ... the seriousness of the offending was self-evident ... There were a significant number of aggravating features: ... this was not opportunistic offending, but, rather, planned conduct with the respondents agreeing to attend at the premises and arming themselves with weapons before arriving; ... the offences were committed in company and at night; ... the offences were at residential premises where it was likely, and indeed the respondents fully expected, residents to be present; ... the purpose of the burglary offences was to enter and, at least, intimidate the occupant by threatening him with weapons; ... the burglary on the house involved threats to Mr Sorrell, and threatening behaviour with weapons; ... the burglary on the caravan involved forcible entry and the breaking of windows; ... threats to Mr Scerri and a serious assault upon him; ... Mr Scerri was outnumbered and tramped, and thus vulnerable to the attack upon him; and ... the offences were, in essence, a revenge or vigilante attack ...</p> <p>At [58] ... offences committee as vigilante action are particularly serious. ... Plainly, Klinger was a willing and active participant in what he believed to be a revenge attack.</p> <p>At [60] The second burglary, that the caravan, was particularly serious because it involved forced entry and the smashing of windows and an assault upon an outnumbered victim on his bed at night. ... The fact that Mr Scerri curled upon his bed in an effort to protect himself is a good indication of the ferocity of the attack.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

		<p>Numerous jobs; difficulties maintaining employment; attempted to join the army; survived on Centrelink benefits.</p> <p>Number of intimate relationships; son born a short time prior to sentencing.</p> <p>History of alcohol abuse; increasing when he suffered depression.</p>	<p>him to stay away from his house and kids. Klinger then screamed words to the effect ‘Do you want to die?’.</p> <p>Mr Scerri att to get up to defend himself. He believed he saw three men, one he recognised as Billett. Mr Scerri could see one of the men had a tomahawk. Mr Scerri was able to chase the men from the caravan.</p> <p>Police arrived at the house to find Mr Scerri bleeding from a large cut to his ankle and numerous cuts to his body. He was taken to hospital by ambulance and treated for various injuries. The most serious a 5 cm laceration and fracture to his ankle that required surgery.</p>		
6.	<p><i>Ugle v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 135</p> <p>Delivered 21/10/2022</p> <p>Co-offender:</p> <p><i>Herz v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 73</p> <p>Delivered 27/06/2022</p>	<p>44 yrs at time offending. 46 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Significant prior criminal history; subject to a CBO at time of offending.</p> <p>Chaotic, deprived and traumatic upbringing; absent father; predominantly raised by grandparents; childhood marred by alcohol abuse and domestic violence; sexually abused by relative from aged 8.</p> <p>Two sisters; mother in a nursing home at time sentencing.</p> <p>Completed yr 12 high school.</p> <p>Employed various roles; voluntary community work.</p> <p>Single; 11 children from three former partners.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Cts 2 & 3: Dep lib. Ct 4: Agg robbery. Cts 5; 6; 8-11; 13 & 14: Agg sex pen. Ct 7: Threats with intent to compel.</p> <p>The victims were Ms S and her friend, Ms P.</p> <p>Ugle had met Ms S on one occasion, to purchase drugs from her. He believed she kept a large quantity of cash at her home. With the intention of stealing the cash Ugle and the co-offender Herz and two unidentified males drove to her home.</p> <p>Ugle and Herz and one of the unidentified males approached the home. Ugle knocked on the door. When the door was partially opened they forced it open and Ugle and Herz entered the house. The other male remained outside acting as lookout. Ugle was carrying a tomahawk and covered his hands in socks.</p> <p>The victims were separated. Ugle,</p>	<p>Ct 1: 5 yrs imp (cum). Cts 2 & 3: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 4 yrs imp (conc). Cts 5; 8 & 13: 17 yrs imp (conc). Cts 6 & 9: 17 yrs 6 mths imp (conc). Ct 7: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 10: 18 yrs imp (conc). Ct 11: 16 yrs 10 mths imp (conc). Ct 14: 18 yrs 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 23 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant’s offending agg by his use of the tomahawk axe, which he used to intimidate, threaten and coerce S into complying with his demands; he gained entry to the home by fraudulent means (identifying himself as a neighbour) and physical force; he was in company; it was premeditated, planned and could not be seen as opportunistic offending and it was not fleeting in nature; the offending destroyed the sanctuary and safety S ought to have felt within the confines of her home and he made multiple threats to harm and kill, adding an element of terror.</p>	<p>Dismissed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned totality principle.</p> <p>At [95] In our view, it was reasonably open to the trial judge in the present case to regard some degree of accumulation of individual sentences to be called for to reflect the overall seriousness of all the appellant’s offending. ...</p> <p>At [96] In assessing the overall criminality involved in the offending considered as a whole it is relevant to take account of the fact that the offences were all committed over a single period of about eight hrs. However, it is also relevant ... the sex offences against S extended over a period of hrs and involved a series of very traumatising sex pen without consent, which themselves justify individual sentences ... The agg home burglary offence was itself a serious example of that offence, involving a home invasion in company while armed ... which was used to threaten the victims. ... The agg robbery offence committed against a separate complainant, P, was itself an egregious offence. ... Forcing S to inject herself with methyl, after she had already done so earlier in the evening at the appellant’s direction, represented a separate violation of S’s personal autonomy and carried the risk of harmful effects. ...</p> <p>At [97] ... a TES of 23 yrs 6 mths’ imp was within the discretionary range properly open to the trial judge. The TES ... did not infringe the first limb of the totality principle. It was not unreasonable or plainly unjust. ...</p>

		<p>History methyl use; commenced using drugs aged 21 yrs.</p>	<p>armed with the tomahawk, kept Ms S in one room and Herz stood over Ms P in another. Ms S was directed to hand over all mobile phones and the house and car keys.</p> <p>Ugle demanded cash from Ms S. When she told him she did not have any he demanded \$4,000 and stated if he did not get this sum he would steal her car and everything in her house.</p> <p>Ugle trashed the home looking for cash or items to steal. While this occurred Herz guarded the victims. Ugle loaded stolen items of property into the boot of Ms S's BMW.</p> <p>Both victims were terrified and helpless and feared being seriously harmed.</p> <p>On realising the home had CCTV cameras Ugle demanded the footage be deleted. Ms S was unable to do so, so he pulled out the CCTV recorder and hard drive and bundled them into the boot of Ms S's car.</p> <p>Ugle became agitated about the absence of cash so Ms P offered to withdraw money from her account. It was agreed Herz would escort her to an ATM. Ugle held the tomahawk above Ms S's head and threatened to kill her and Ms P's family if she called the police or failed to return. Ms P withdrew \$1,000 from an ATM. This money was given to Ugle, who then demanded she withdraw \$1,000 each day, over the next three days. He told Ms P he would keep Ms S hostage until the full amount was paid. He made further threats to kill her and her family if she did not comply with his demands.</p> <p>Ms P was eventually allowed to leave. Ugle then told Herz he could leave and he did so.</p> <p>After Herz left Ugle, still holding the</p>	<p>The trial judge found the sex offending deplorable violations that destroyed, not only the sanctity of S's body, but the sanctuary of her home; the sex penetrations were violent and forceful in nature; while the offending constituted one course of conduct, it nevertheless was persistent, ongoing, repetitive and brutal; the appellant sex penetrated S persistently over the course of three to four hrs; collectively this offending included every conceivable type of penetration to the victim and he recorded the offences; he did not wear a condom; when the victim cried and pleaded with him to stop, it did nothing to deter him from continuing to violate her and he berated S for not acting like she was enjoying the abuse.</p> <p>Offending traumatic and ongoing impact on S and P; trauma to S, devastating and widespread; att suicide.</p> <p>No demonstrated remorse or victim empathy.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--

		<p>tomahawk, started touching Ms S's leg. She became extremely upset and told him she did not want to do anything with him. Angered by her response and ignoring her refusals he pulled down her leggings and recorded her with her underwear down. He asked for sex and she complied out of fear. He forced his finger deep inside Ms S, causing her pain. He then forced his erect penis inside her mouth and exposed and touched her vagina, while recording her.</p> <p>Earlier Ms S offered methyl to Ugle and Herz, in the hope of de-escalating the situation. Concerned there might be something wrong with the drugs Ugle told Ms P to inject some of it. Instead, Ms S allowed Ugle to inject her.</p> <p>Later Ugle arranged for Herz to return to Ms S's home with more methyl. Ugle injected himself with some of the drug and then directed Ms S to inject herself too. She refused. Angry, he threatened that if she did not do so he would make her take all of the drug. Compelled by Ugle's threats, and despite being fearful of an overdose, she injected herself.</p> <p>Ugle then directed Ms S into the bedroom. He tried to kiss Ms S, then removed her clothes. Ms S was crying and extremely upset. He filmed himself performing cunnilingus on M S. He then forced her to perform fellatio on him, ignoring her pleas when she told him she did not want to. Ugle then again inserted his penis into her vagina.</p> <p>Due to the aggressive manner in which Ugle was penetrating her Ms S began to bleed. He told her to take a shower. Inserting his finger into her anus before she did so. While Ms S showered he entered the ensuite and unsuccessfully att to insert his penis into her vagina from behind.</p> <p>Out of the shower Ugle again</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>performed cunnilingus on Ms S. He then forcefully had intercourse with her. The tomahawk still next to him. Ms S was crying and clearly distressed. Ugle responded with fits of anger and told her to stop crying and to start acting like she was enjoying it.</p> <p>The sexual offending lasted three to four hrs. At the conclusion of the sexual assaults Ms S suggested to Ugle that they drive to her mother's home, where she could get the money he wanted. Ugle agreed. At Ms S's mother house he told her to collect the cash and to immediately return to the vehicle, while he waited in the car. Inside the house Ms S's mother saw her in a highly distressed state, crying and shaking. She told her mother she had been raped and she immediately called the police.</p> <p>Concerned Ms S was taking much longer than anticipated Ugle concealed the tomahawk in the car, left the vehicle and started to walk away. On hearing sirens he began to run. He was pursued by police, who apprehended and arrest him.</p>		
5.	<p><i>Creusot v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 117</p> <p>Delivered 06/09/2022</p>	<p><u>Creusot</u> 56 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Substantial criminal history.</p> <p>Parents separated while young; primarily raised by grandmother; irregular contact with father; ongoing and supportive relationship with mother and sisters.</p> <p>Completed yr 10.</p> <p>Employed truck driver 25 yrs, until loss of his MDL.</p> <p>16 yr relationship; two children; history of domestic violence.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Agg armed robbery.</p> <p>Creusot and Howell broke into a home unit, smashing a window to gain entry. One was armed with a handgun. They were both wearing hooded jumpers pulled tightly over their faces.</p> <p>The victim, on hearing a noise, called out and armed himself with a torch and can of pepper spray. When he discovered Creusot and Howell attempting to get in he attempted to fend them off by brandishing the torch.</p> <p>The handgun was pointed at the victim. Creusot and Howell then took turns searching for money, while the other held the gun at the victim and demanded money.</p>	<p><u>Creusot</u> Ct 1: 3 yrs 4 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 7 yrs 10 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p><u>Howell</u> Ct 1: 3 yrs 4 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 4 yrs 6 mths imp (cum). Conc with sentence already serving.</p> <p>TES 7 yrs 10 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellants' offending at the high end of seriousness for offences of this kind; it was premeditated; involved the use of a disguise and the</p>	<p>Dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence (totality and double punishment). Individual sentences not challenged.</p> <p>At [191] ... ct 2 was, as the trial judge observed, a very serious example of agg armed robbery. The appellants disguised themselves and brought with them a loaded handgun. They used the gun in demanding money from the complainant. Further, one of the appellants deliberately discharged the gun.</p> <p>At [195] ... if ct 2 were viewed in isolation from ct 1, the sentence imposed ... would be so low as to invite the question – why is the sentence so low? ... far from revealing the trial judge's failure to have regard to the need to avoid double punishment, the individual sentences imposed on ct 2 positively point to the conclusion that her Honour properly did so.</p> <p>At [192] These agg features of the appellants' offending distinguished it from the vast majority of agg armed robbery offences, underlining the seriousness of the appellants' offending.</p>

		<p>Entrenched history of alcohol, cannabis and methyl use; willingness to engage in substance abuse counselling.</p> <p><u>Howell</u> 40 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Substantial criminal history. Repeat offender.</p> <p>One of four children; good relationship with mother and sisters; father mostly absent; witnessed violence and substance abuse.</p> <p>Attended school until yr 7.</p> <p>Never employed.</p> <p>22 yr relationship; acts of domestic violence against his partner; three children.</p> <p>Solvent and cannabis use from aged 12 yrs; methyl use; sustained from drugs in custody.</p>	<p>They repeatedly asked the victim to identify the location of his money. He denied having any.</p> <p>In an effort to extract information from the victim, the gun was fired into a wardrobe, near to where the victim was sitting.</p> <p>Before leaving the unit, the victim was threatened he would be killed if he went to the police.</p> <p>Creusot and Howell were later identified by DNA from blood inside the house. They denied ever being at the unit.</p>	<p>bringing of a handgun; the use of violence in physically assaulting the victim was gratuitous, given the absence of resistance; the victim was vulnerable and the appellants were armed and the use of the gun was particularly serious as it was not only brandished, but it was fired.</p> <p>The trial judge found only a term of imp the only appropriate sentence given the seriousness of the offending.</p> <p><u>Creusot</u> Offending agg by fact one month before offending placed on CSIO.</p> <p><u>Howell</u> High risk of reoffending if unable to abstain from drug use.</p>	<p>At [208] The appellants' offence by ct 1 was in the more serious category of a violent home invasion.</p> <p>At [222] ... it cannot reasonably be argued that the TES ... infringed the first limb of the totality principle. That total sentence bears a proper relationship to the overall criminality of each of the appellants' offending ...</p>
4.	<p><i>The State of Western Australia v McDonagh</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 108</p> <p>Delivered 22/08/2022</p>	<p>35 yrs at time offending. 37 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after late PG (25% discount).</p> <p>Significant prior criminal history.</p> <p>503 days spent in custody prior to sentencing.</p> <p>Dysfunctional deprived upbringing; violent father; parents separated when an infant; lived with mother; limited contact with his father; felt neglected, rejected and abandoned by his father.</p> <p>Mother's new partner verbally,</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Agg armed robbery.</p> <p>McDonagh and four co-offenders travelled to the home unit of the victims, Mr H and Ms G. McDonagh was carrying a large spanner, hidden up his sleeve.</p> <p>At the unit Ms G, partially opened the front door. As she did so, one of the co-offenders pulled her out of the doorway by her hair. She was wearing only a towel. She ran and hid between some cars.</p> <p>McDonagh and the co-offenders then entered the unit. Mr H was inside and retreated to a bedroom where he tried</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 3 yrs imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 3 yrs imp. CSIO 18 mths.</p> <p>Genuinely remorseful; insight into his offending; acceptance of responsibility; cooperative with law enforcement.</p> <p>Abstained from alcohol and illicit substances; complied with all conditions and directions of home detention bail.</p> <p>Offending profound psychological impact on victim Mr H.</p>	<p>Allowed.</p> <p>Appeal concerned plea discount; error in finding (cooperation provided) and length and type of sentence.</p> <p>Resentenced to (10% discount):</p> <p>Ct 1: 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 2: 5 yrs imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 5 yrs 6 mths imp. EFP.</p> <p>At [57] The respondent's offending on ct 1 and ct 2 was egregious. The offending involved some planning and premeditation. The respondent acted in company. The circumstances of the commission of the offence would have been frightening to the victims. The respondent seriously assaulted [Mr H] with the spanner. The victims' home was damaged. Property was stolen. ... The respondent's PGs were</p>

		<p>emotionally, physically and sexually abusive; this relationship ended when aged about 5 yrs.</p> <p>Another of mother's relationships lasted about seven yrs; this man was charged, convicted and imp for sex abuse of his eldest half-sister.</p> <p>Alternated living between his parents until aged about 19 yrs.</p> <p>Three significant relationships; young autistic son.</p> <p>Current partner and mother remain very supportive.</p> <p>Bullied at school; antisocial peer group; expelled yr 9.</p> <p>Completed yr 10 at TAFE; number of employment courses.</p> <p>Employed various labouring roles; number of periods of unemployment.</p> <p>Diagnosed with ADHD; medicated since aged 13 yrs; diagnosed and medicated for depression, anxiety and PTSD.</p> <p>History of illicit drug use; under influence of alcohol, cannabis and methyl at time offending.</p>	<p>unsuccessfully to escape through a window. He then shut the door and barricaded it. Outside McDonagh yelled out to Mr H words to the effect that he was going to kill him as he owned them money.</p> <p>McDonagh then kicked the door multiple times and struck it with the spanner, damaging it and causing a large hole. He then struck Mr H on the arm with the spanner through the hole he had created.</p> <p>McDonagh and one of the co-offenders then forced the door open and ran into the bedroom. McDonagh and two co-offenders surrounded Mr H and demanded property and money from him. McDonagh also struck Mr H several times with the spanner to the head and body. A co-offender then grabbed Mr H's wallet containing \$470 in cash, a gold necklace and a mobile telephone.</p> <p>After taking these items McDonagh and the co-offenders left the unit together.</p> <p>Ms G suffered soreness to her back and neck. Mr H suffered bruising, a significant muscle tear in his arm and a cut requiring sutures.</p>		<p>mitigating, but were indicated and entered at a late stage of the proceedings. ... the respondent is at a high risk of future violent offending unless he continues to address the problems referred to [in the psychological report]. ...</p> <p>At [64] In the present case, after evaluating the sentence ... for ct 1 ... we are satisfied that it was not reasonably open to the sentencing judge to fail to be satisfied that it was inappropriate to suspend or conditionally suspend (wholly or partly) the sentence of imp. ...</p> <p>At [70] In the present case, after evaluating the sentence ... imposed by her Honour for ct 2 ... we are of the opinion that the sentence was manifestly inadequate as to type.</p> <p>At [84] We have further reduced each sentence that we would otherwise have imposed for each offence to recognise the respondent's compliance with the conditionally sus sentences imposed by the sentencing judge ...</p> <p>At [87] ... we have reduced the sentence we would otherwise have imposed for ct 1 from 3 yrs immediate imp ... for the purpose of totality and to avoid punishing the respondent twice ... In particular, the respondent has been punished for his violence and his AOBH in the resentencing for ct 2, but not in the resentencing for ct 1.</p>
3.	<p><i>Herz v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 73</p> <p>Delivered 27/06/2022</p>	<p>54 yrs at time offending. 56 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Criminal history; no prior sentences of imp.</p> <p>Raised loving and supportive family environment.</p> <p>Educated to yr 11.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Cts 2 & 3: Dep lib. Ct 4: Agg armed robbery.</p> <p>The victims were Ms S and her friend, Ms P.</p> <p>The co-offender Ugle had sold drugs to Ms S and he believed she kept a large quantity of cash at her home. With the intention of stealing the cash Ugle and Herz drove to Ms S's home. Herz and Ugle were accompanied by two</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: 2 yrs imp (conc) Ct 3: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 4: 3 yrs 3 mths imp (cum).</p> <p>TES 7 yrs 3 mths.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>Appellant sentenced on basis he was not the principle offender.</p> <p>The sentencing judge described the offending</p>	<p>Dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned error in sentencing (double punishment cts 1 and 4) and parity principle.</p> <p>At [42] ... Each offence (cts 1 and 4) had some significantly different circumstances. Notably, each theft involved a different victim. Each offence also involved some significantly different legal and factual elements. Although the offences occurred in the course of one overall series of criminal actions, there is nothing in the sentencing remarks to indicate that her Honour infringed the principle against double punishment. Each individual sentence for cts 1 and 4 was towards the lower end of the range open ... on a proper exercise of her discretion.</p>

		<p>Employed number of positions; owned and ran successful business.</p> <p>Previous long-term relationship; two adult children.</p> <p>Suffers back pain from degenerative spine; depression; 2008 suicide attempt.</p> <p>Cannabis use aged 16 yrs; commenced using methyl aged 39 yrs; abstinent from methyl eight yrs; recommenced using 2017; continued methyl use on bail in breach of bail condition.</p>	<p>unidentified males.</p> <p>Herz, Ugle and one of the unidentified males approached the home. Ugle knocked on the door. When the door was partially opened he and Herz forced it open and entered the house. The other male remained outside acting as lookout.</p> <p>Ugle was carrying a tomahawk and covered his hands in socks.</p> <p>The victims were separated. Herz stood over Ms P in one room and Ugle, still armed with the tomahawk, kept Ms P in another. Ms S was directed to hand over all mobile phones and the house and car keys to prevent the victims from leaving.</p> <p>Ugle demanded cash from Ms S. When she told him she did not have any he demanded \$4,000 and stated if he did not get this sum he would steal her car and everything in her house. Ms S, scared and in shock began to cry.</p> <p>Ugle then trashed the home looking for cash or valuable items to steal. While this occurred Herz guarded the victims. Eventually Ugle loaded stolen items of property into the boot of Ms S's BMW.</p> <p>At some point Herz picked up the tomahawk.</p> <p>Both victims were terrified and helpless and feared being seriously harmed.</p> <p>When Ms P questioned whether they would be killed Herz told her if she did not do as she was told she would be.</p> <p>On realising the home had CCTV cameras Ugle demanded the footage be deleted. When Ms S was unable to do so he pulled out the CCTV recorder and hard drive and bundled them into the boot of Ms S's car.</p>	<p>as 'serious criminal behaviour' and characterised the severity of the offending as being 'at the very least mid-range'.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the appellant and Ugle committed the offences in company and armed with an offensive weapon and the victims' vulnerable women who were subjected to threats to kill.</p> <p>Victims severely and adversely traumatised.</p> <p>No finding of genuine remorse or victim empathy.</p>	<p>At [46] ... While the appellant's involvement in the offending was less than that of Mr Ugle, it was significant. He actively assisted Mr Ugle to forcibly enter (Ms S's) house. He offered support, encouragement and muscle in subduing the victims, both of whom were vulnerable, and terrifying them into submission. The appellant stood watch over [Ms S] and [Ms P] while Mr Ugle searched the house and stole various items. The appellant accompanied [Ms P] to the ATM to ensure she withdrew \$1,000 in cash and obtained from her the PIN to her ATM card, which Mr Ugle intended to use to withdraw, ... another \$3,000. ... The sentencing judge characterised the appellant's role with respect to ct 2 and 3 as 'crucial'. This characterisation is correct.</p> <p>At [48] Despite the fact that the offences were part of one criminal transaction, they were multi-faceted. Some accumulation was required in order to appropriately reflect the appellant's overall criminality.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Ugle became agitated about the absence of cash so Ms P offered to withdraw money from her bank account. Herz escorted her to an ATM. Prior to their leaving Ugle held the tomahawk above Ms S's head and threatened to kill her and Ms P's family if she called the police or failed to return with the cash.</p> <p>Ms P withdrew \$1,000 from an ATM and gave the money to Herz, who gave the cash to Ugle on his return to the house. Ugle then demanded that she withdraw \$1,000 each day, over the next three days. He told her he would keep Ms S hostage until the full amount was paid. Ugle made further threats to kill Ms S, Ms P and her family if she did not comply with his demands.</p> <p>Ms P was eventually allowed to leave, but not before Herz asked for, and received, the PIN to her account.</p>		
2.	<p>Miller v The State of Western Australia</p> <p>[2022] WASCA 50</p> <p>Delivered 06/05/2022</p>	<p>22 yrs at time offending. 23 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after early PG (20% discount).</p> <p>Prior criminal history.</p> <p>Diagnosed with ADHD as a child; medicated.</p> <p>Struggled at school; left school yr 10.</p> <p>Consistent employment since leaving school; held in high regard by his employer.</p> <p>Supportive partner; assists with care of his partner's three children; partner employed and does not use illicit drugs.</p> <p>History of illicit substance use; abstained from using drugs about a yr before sentencing.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Cts 2-6: Criminal damage.</p> <p>Miller was in company with a 17-yr-old co-offender, his younger half-brother MJ.</p> <p>In the early hrs of the morning Miller and MJ went to a residential premises looking for a young man who had allegedly participated in an assault on MJ earlier that day. Miller was heavily intoxicated. They entered the property through a closed gate.</p> <p>Miller and MJ were both armed with weapons. MJ took with him a hockey stick and Miller picked up a rake which he found at the premises. They began by smashing the home's windows. They then gained entry to the house by forcing open a flyscreen door and smashing the glass door. Inside the house Miller broke a washing machine, caused damage to a door and smashed internal glass windows.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 3 yrs imp (cum). Ct 2: No penalty. Ct 3: 6 mths imp (cum). Ct 4-6: 6 mths imp each ct (conc).</p> <p>TES 3 yrs 6 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>Co-offender sentenced in Children's Court to 12 mths ISO and 100 hrs community service.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offending involved the persistent and gratuitous destruction of property for no obvious purpose; they both had weapons meaning 'there was a danger that matters could have escalated, and people could have been seriously injured'; the appellant and MJ were equally responsible for the acts of the other.</p> <p>The sentencing judge found the offences of such seriousness that sentences of immediate imp were required.</p> <p>Appellant remorseful.</p>	<p>Dismissed (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of sentence ct 1; totality and parity principle.</p> <p>At [54] ... the facts and circumstances of the appellant's offending on ct 1 were very serious. ...</p> <p>At [58] ... the appellant offended jointly, as a matter of law and fact, with his younger co-offender.</p> <p>At [59] ... we do not accept, that the offending was not 'pre-planned'. ... There appears to have been some premeditation in relation to the agg home burglary.</p> <p>At [60] It is true that no physical harm was caused to the complainants, but that merely demonstrates that the offending could have been worse. The absence of an agg factor does not diminish the seriousness of what the appellant and his co-offender actually did.</p> <p>At [61] In our opinion, the sentence for ct 1 was commensurate with the seriousness of the offence. ... It was not appropriate, in view of the objective seriousness of the offending, to suspend or conditionally suspend any of the term of imp for ct 1.</p> <p>At [66] The appellant and his co-offender deliberately and wantonly damaged each vehicle the subject of cts 3, 4, 5 and 6. The vandalism</p>

		<p>Prescribed anti-anxiety medication aged 18 yrs; ceased this medication two wks before offending.</p>	<p>The victims awoke and walked into the hallway.</p> <p>The man Miller and MJ were trying to locate was not present.</p> <p>While at the property Miller and MJ also used the weapons to smash the windscreens and side windows of four vehicles parked at the premises.</p> <p>Miller and MJ then got into a motor vehicle and left.</p>		<p>was unprovoked. ... The objective seriousness of the offending on each of those cts, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the offending as a whole and all relevant sentencing factors, required the imposition of a term of imp for each of cts 3, 4, 5 and 6. ...</p> <p>At [70] In our opinion, the TES ... did not infringe the first limb of the totality principle. A custodial term of that length was required in order properly to mark the very serious character of the appellant's offending as a whole ...</p> <p>At [80] ... we are satisfied that the sentencing outcome for the appellant, compared to the sentencing outcome for MJ, does not reveal an unjustifiable disparity adverse to the appellant and favourable to MJ.</p>
1.	<p><i>Fernie v The State of Western Australia</i></p> <p>[2022] WASCA 20</p> <p>Delivered 18/02/2022</p>	<p>23 yrs at time offending. 25 yrs at time sentencing.</p> <p>Convicted after trial.</p> <p>Substantial criminal history.</p> <p>Highly dysfunctional upbringing; left home aged 14 yrs; homeless a number of yrs.</p> <p>Left school yr 9.</p> <p>Some labouring work.</p> <p>Relationship at time of sentencing.</p> <p>Commenced cannabis use in his youth; methyl from aged 19 yrs.</p>	<p>Ct 1: Agg burg. Ct 2: Unlawful wounding. Ct 3: GBH.</p> <p>Late at night Fernie, and two co-offenders, armed with a machete and crowbar, went to the home of the victims, CMK and his son, CDK. The three men were disguised. They kicked in the front door and prising open the screen door with the crowbar.</p> <p>Inside the home Fernie and the co-offenders made threats of violence towards the victims. CMK's young daughter was sleeping in a nearby bedroom.</p> <p>Fernie participated in an assault upon CMK. To defend his father CDK stabbed Fernie in the arm. Fernie was hospitalised as a result.</p> <p>During the course of the burglary both victims were struck with the machete. CMK sustained a laceration to his forearm while defending himself from the ongoing assault.</p> <p>CDK sustained serious injuries to his fingers after being struck by the machete. One of his index fingers required surgery.</p>	<p>Ct 1: 4 yrs imp (conc). Ct 2: 2 yrs imp (conc). Ct 3: 8 yrs 2 mths imp (conc).</p> <p>TES 8 yrs 2 mths imp.</p> <p>EFP.</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant criminally responsible for cts 2 and 3 on the basis that he knowingly aided another person to commit the offences (s 7(c) <i>Criminal Code</i>) and, alternatively, the offences were a probable consequence of the common intention formed by him and the co-offenders to prosecute an unlawful purpose of agg burglary (s 8 <i>Criminal Code</i>).</p> <p>The trial judge found the appellant's offending agg by the fact he was in company with other disguised offenders who were also armed; the offences were committed at a family residence late at night; the victim of ct 3 sustained serious injuries and at the time the appellant was the subject of a CBO and a CSIO.</p> <p>No demonstrated remorse or acceptance of responsibility for the offending.</p>	<p>Dismissed – on papers (leave refused).</p> <p>Appeal concerned length of individual sentences and totality principle.</p> <p>At [33] Ct 3 could not reasonably be described as being in the least serious category of case, having regard to the circumstances in which it was committed; ... including the nature of the injuries sustained by CDK; ...</p> <p>At [34] ... it is not reasonably arguable that the sentence imposed on ct 3 was manifestly excessive. ... the appellant's claim that the individual sentences on cts 1 and 2 were manifestly excessive has no merit. Taken separately, each of those offences was a serious example of its type and the sentences that were imposed were well within the discretionary range ...</p>