

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT 1975

Report of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal for the remuneration of Judges, District Court Judges, Masters of the Supreme Court, Magistrates and the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission No. 1 of 2025

PREAMBLE

Executive Summary

1. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has recommended the remuneration for judicial officers be increased by 3.5% with effect from 1 December 2025. The recommended changes are summarised below.

Base Data		3.5% increase	
Position	Current Salary	\$ Impact	New Salary
Chief Justice	\$587,569	\$20,565	\$608,134
President of the Court of Appeal	\$550,004	\$19,250	\$569,254
Senior Puisne Judge	\$525,214	\$18,382	\$543,596
Senior Judge of the Court of Appeal	\$525,214	\$18,382	\$543,596
Puisne Judge	\$509,701	\$17,840	\$527,541
Senior Master of the Supreme Court	\$472,421	\$16,535	\$488,956
Master of the Supreme Court	\$458,846	\$16,060	\$474,906
Chief Judge District Court	\$509,701	\$17,840	\$527,541
Senior Judge District Court	\$472,421	\$16,535	\$488,956
Judge District Court	\$458,846	\$16,060	\$474,906
Chief Magistrate	\$458,846	\$16,060	\$474,906
Deputy Chief Magistrate	\$402,349	\$14,082	\$416,431
Principal Registrar / Magistrate Supreme Court	\$402,349	\$14,082	\$416,431
Principal Registrar / Magistrate Family Court	\$402,349	\$14,082	\$416,431
Magistrates	\$378,750	\$13,256	\$392,006
Registrars / Magistrates Family Court	\$378,750	\$13,256	\$392,006
Parliamentary Inspector, Corruption and Crime Commission	\$305,820	\$10,704	\$316,524

Background

2. Section 7 of the *Salaries and Allowances Act 1975* (the Act) requires the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal (the Tribunal) to inquire into and report to the Minister for Public Sector Management in relation to possible changes in the remuneration paid or provided to:
 - Judges
 - District Court Judges
 - Masters of the Supreme Court
 - Magistrates
 - the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission.
3. The Act states that the Tribunal must recommend the nature and extent of any changes to remuneration, if considered necessary.
4. Section 7(4) states that any changes recommended in this report are to come into effect on the date specified in this report unless either House of Parliament passes a resolution disapproving a recommendation made by the Tribunal.

Current inquiry

5. In discharging its statutory requirements with respect to the remuneration of the Judiciary, the Tribunal has:
 - considered submissions from office holders and key stakeholders
 - consulted with the Chief Justice and the Director General of the Department of Justice
 - noted key economic indicators, the financial strategy and Budget of the WA State Government and had regard to the State Wages Policy Statement
 - examined the historical and current salary relativities between judicial offices and with other jurisdictions to ensure that Western Australian salaries and conditions remain competitive
 - factored the impact on the State Budget of any potential increase including the flow-on effect to the judicial pension.

Submissions and consultations

6. In summary, submissions requested the Tribunal provide an increase in salary for judicial office holders to:
 - restore pre-2016 relativities with the Federal Court, with suggestions ranging from a 5% increase to gradually restore the relativities to a 9.2% increase to immediately restore the pre-2016 relativities

- change the internal relativities of positions, arguing that some positions have either experienced work value increases in comparison to other judicial positions, or that the judicial pension for judges not applying to Magistrates has a distorting nature
- compensate for working conditions, including workload, expanded jurisdictions and the psychosocial hazards faced by members of the judiciary
- resolve attraction and retention issues, as the Courts are competing with the private sector and other Australian jurisdictions to recruit suitably experienced applicants.

7. With respect to motor vehicles, some submissions requested:

- a significant increase to the value of the motor vehicle allowance due to rising motor vehicle costs
- the allowance should be large enough for officers to receive top of the line luxury vehicles, such as the Mercedes Benz E Class as standard
- that unused portions of the motor vehicle allowance be carried over to the next lease
- removal of provisions which prohibit the use of office-based charging infrastructure for Electric Vehicles (EVs).

8. The issue of regional housing for Magistrates directed to serve in regional areas was also raised.

Economic considerations

9. Table 1 sets out key economic indicators for the Western Australian and National economies.

Table 1: WA State and National Selected Economic Indicators 2025

Indicator	Percentage Change	Annual Average % Increase
Perth - Consumer Price Index – July 2025 Mth ¹	1.9%	2.7%
National - Consumer Price Index – June 2025 Qtr ²	0.7%	2.1%
WA - Wage Price Index – June 2025 Qtr ³	0.8%	3.7%
National - Wage Price Index – June 2025 Qtr	0.6%	3.4%
WA Total Unemployment Rate – July 2025 Mth ⁴	0.1%	4.2%
National Total Unemployment Rate – July 2025 Mth ⁵	-0.1%	4.2%

¹ West Australian Treasury Corporation (30 July 2025). [CPI June & Q2 2025](#). Percentage change over previous quarter.

² Australian Bureau of Statistics. (30 July 2025). [Consumer Price Index, Australia](#)

³ Australian Bureau of Statistics. (13 August 2025). [Wage Price Index, Australia](#)

⁴ Australian Bureau of Statistics. (14 August 2025). [Labour Force, Australia](#)

⁵ Based on Seasonally adjusted data.

10. In December 2023, the State Government announced the new [State Wages Policy Statement](#). The policy does not provide a set percentage for wage negotiations, but shifts to a principle based bargaining position which focuses on:
- delivering wage increases and conditions that are reasonable in the context of each negotiation and financially sustainable
 - supporting the longer term attraction and retention of skilled public sector workers
 - initiatives supporting the commitment to direct and permanent employment as the preferred mode of employment
 - improving the operations and performance of public sector organisations
 - employment conditions that Government considers should be universal across the WA public sector.
11. The Tribunal has consistently applied these bargaining principles across its various jurisdictions. Although the policy is specific to the public sector, the underlying principles, such as ensuring wage increases are reasonable in light of the State's economic conditions, supporting the attraction and retention of judges, and enhancing the judiciary's operations and performance, are all relevant and applicable to the 2025 inquiry.
12. The Tribunal has also reviewed the WA State Government 2025-26 Budget and associated Economic and Fiscal Outlook published by the State Government in May 2025.⁶

Relativities to other jurisdictions

13. Within remuneration bodies across Australia, it is broadly accepted that the remuneration provided to a Judge of the Federal Court is the benchmark for setting the remuneration of Puisne Judges of State Supreme Courts. Internal relativities within each jurisdiction's judicial levels are set from that starting point. The actual relativities between the Federal Court and State Supreme Courts have varied over the last decade, notably due to wage freezes in WA (2017-2021) and NSW (2023-2025).
14. The Federal Remuneration Tribunal provided a 2.4% increase for the federal judiciary, effective 1 July 2025. Where there is no legislative link in remuneration, interstate Tribunals have increasingly provided remuneration increases based on local circumstances. Over the last 12 months, increases have ranged from 3.5% in Victoria (October 2024) and South Australia (September 2024) to 4% in NSW (July 2025) and ACT (November 2024). The remuneration of Queensland and Tasmania judicial office holders is legislatively linked to the Federal Court.

⁶ Government of Western Australia (June 2025) [Budget Papers 2025-26](#)

Remuneration setting and Tribunal recommendations

Judicial salaries

15. The Tribunal recommends a remuneration increase of 3.5% for judicial offices within this report, with an effective date of 1 December 2025.
16. This increase is above the increase provided to Federal Court judges and follows the 2024 increase which was also above that provided to Federal Court members. The relativity of a Puisne Judge in Western Australia, in comparison with a Federal Court Judge has risen from 94% in 2022 to 99.5% in 2025.
17. The Tribunal acknowledges that there are attraction and retention issues within the judiciary. While remuneration is only one factor, the Tribunal does not believe that salary increases above 3.5% and up to 9% are appropriate at this time. The increase provided in this report continues to improve the relativities between the Federal Court and WA Puisne Judges, but within community expectations and standards.
18. Other attraction and retention issues such as workload management or the psychosocial hazards faced by members of the judiciary are not something that can be addressed by the Tribunal through remuneration, though it would support any initiatives by the employing or administrative agencies in supporting judicial officers through these issues.
19. The Tribunal has considered requests by some levels of the judiciary to modify the relativities between the levels that are currently in place. The basis for these requests is mostly centred around both an increase in work volume as well as in work value or the lack of a judicial pension provided to Magistrates. The Tribunal has again reviewed the responsibilities of various levels of the judiciary and concluded that the changes in work volume are reflected across the judiciary and are accommodated within the existing relativities. The Tribunal is very hesitant to alter the internal relativities of certain judicial office holders without the full judiciary's support.

Motor vehicles

20. The Tribunal received several requests for a substantial increase to the motor vehicle entitlement. The Tribunal considered the proposition that members of the judiciary should be provided, as standard and at no cost, the highest level of luxury vehicles such as BMWs or Mercedes Benz. The current entitlement does allow for smaller sized luxury vehicles within the current limit. But the variations in leasing costing and specifications of vehicles means that, depending on the personal choice, sometimes the judicial officer will be required to make additional contributions to obtain the vehicle of choice.

21. The lease costs for motor vehicles are subject to market conditions. State Fleet has advised that, in the past, they have often been able to make arrangements with suppliers to purchase vehicles at a reduced cost. With the supply side issues caused by COVID-19, suppliers have been more unwilling to enter into these arrangements, meaning the lease costs for those vehicles has increased. However, the Tribunal does not agree that because judicial office holders were able to access a particular vehicle at a reduced price in the past, that the vehicle should be available in perpetuity.
22. The motor vehicle entitlement is provided to judicial office holders based on the principles listed in Part 3.4 of this report. The current entitlement provides for the conveyance needs, adequate safety and security and represents fair value and benefit. It is not intended to cover every personal choice each judicial office holder may have. The alternative approach would be for the Tribunal to select a specific vehicle, or choice of two or three vehicles and restrict judicial office holders to these selected vehicles. This would take personal choice away from judicial office holders, but it would eliminate the need for a dollar value of the lease. At this moment, the Tribunal remains in favour of allowing judicial office holders the choice to make their own personal selection to suit their conveyance needs which they can choose to be serviced either entirely within the current limit or to exceed the limit and make additional personal contributions.
23. The Tribunal continuously monitors the value of motor vehicle entitlements in consultation with State Fleet. As recently as August, State Fleet advised that changes to some lease categories meant that some vehicles will have lease cost increases in October, while others, including some battery electric vehicles, will see a decrease.
24. The fluctuating nature of vehicle lease costs means that the Tribunal does not apply CPI increases to the value annually. While the Tribunal can increase the entitlement value when lease values have had sustained increases, the Tribunal does not wish to reduce the value when there are price drops such as reduced lease fees, purchase prices or fuel costs.
25. The Tribunal has chosen not to increase the motor vehicle entitlement throughout 2025 and has maintained this approach in this recommendation report. The Tribunal will continue to monitor costs in the future.
26. The Tribunal also considered requests relating to the recharging of EVs. The Tribunal has reworded the recharging entitlements under Part 3.10 of this report. However, advice from State Fleet indicates that the preferred method of recharging EVs is at home with overnight charging. Although the costs of such recharging will vary depending on factors such as solar power or battery, the average costs of charging is approximately \$15 per week.

27. State Fleet is currently working on providing the recharging infrastructure required to achieve the government's goal of 50% of the government's vehicle fleet being EVs. This is a difficult task due to several issues such as limited space, dealing with private property owners, heritage issues, costs or limitations of current infrastructure. State Fleet is currently rolling out charging stations in government accommodation, but this is on a one for one basis, meaning one recharger for each EV in the government fleet. Therefore, it is State Fleet policy, which is supported by the Tribunal, that the recharging stations installed in government accommodation must be prioritised for government fleet vehicles provided for business purposes over SAT provided vehicles or personal vehicles. Each department can manage the use of their recharging facilities as best suits their arrangements in regard to making rechargers available to staff private vehicles of SAT provided vehicles so long as it complies with State Fleet policies.
28. Although judicial office holders are expected to recharge their EVs at home overnight at the cost of approximately \$15 per week, it should be noted that selecting an EV will still be beneficial to judicial office holders as the motor vehicle entitlement has a built-in fuel cost of between 25%-33% of the value. There are also potential Fringe Benefit Tax savings. Selecting an EV means that judicial office holders can select a higher standard of vehicle vis-à-vis a fuel vehicle by allocating the fuel component of the lease costs to the purchase price.
29. The Tribunal will continue to liaise with State Fleet as the recharging infrastructure for EVs matures and will alter the entitlement when required.

Regional housing allowance

30. The Tribunal received an update from the Department of Justice outlining initiatives that have been implemented or are currently underway to support regional housing for Magistrates.
31. The Tribunal acknowledges that Magistrates may be directed to work in regional areas. As previously stated, the Tribunal considers the provision of housing in these circumstances to be an employment condition rather than a matter of remuneration. The Tribunal supports the department's initiatives, which include establishing set rental contributions for tenants, the provision of GROH housing in Bunbury, and progressing the development of regional housing arrangements for Magistrates beyond the standard GROH parameters.

Superannuation

32. The Tribunal considered proposals to either increase the rate of superannuation payments for Magistrates above the superannuation guarantee or to increase their salary in lieu of a Judicial pension. The Tribunal does not support either of these proposals.

33. The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to determine eligibility for judicial pension entitlements. The proposal that Magistrates should be compensated for not receiving the judicial pension (established in 1950) is not supported. This entitlement does not extend to other members of the community, and its absence does not, in itself, justify supplementary remuneration. While Magistrates are part of the judiciary, this alone does not constitute sufficient rationale to provide additional salary and alter internal relativities.
34. The claims that Magistrates are subject to Division 293 of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997* and should therefore receive a higher superannuation entitlement are not supported. Receiving a salary that is of high enough value that members are subject to additional taxation, which is outside the remit of the Tribunal, is not an argument to be provided with more remuneration to compensate for that taxation.

Tabling of the Report

35. The Act requires this report to be tabled in each House of Parliament within five sitting days of the Minister for Public Sector Management receiving it. Changes to remuneration will come into force from the date specified in this report unless either House of Parliament, within 15 sitting days of the report being tabled in that House, passes a resolution disapproving the Tribunal's recommendation.
36. This report will now issue.

REPORT

This report may be cited as the Judicial Report No. 1 of 2025.

PART 1: SALARY

- 1.1 The annual salaries specified in table 2 shall be payable to Judges, Masters and Magistrates with effect from 1 December 2025, and are inclusive of leave loading.

Table 2: Annual salaries

Position	Annual Salary
Chief Justice	\$608,134
President of the Court of Appeal	\$569,254
Senior Puisne Judge	\$543,596
Senior Judge of the Court of Appeal	\$543,596
Puisne Judge	\$527,541
Senior Master of the Supreme Court	\$488,956
Master of the Supreme Court	\$474,906
Chief Judge District Court	\$527,541
Senior Judge District Court	\$488,956
Judge District Court	\$474,906
Chief Magistrate	\$474,906
Deputy Chief Magistrate	\$416,431
Principal Registrar/Magistrate Supreme Court *	\$416,431
Principal Registrar/Magistrate Family Court *	\$416,431
Magistrate	\$392,006
Registrar/Magistrate Family Court*	\$392,006
Parliamentary Inspector, Corruption and Crime Commission	\$316,524

* The relevant office holders remunerated under this Part hold commissions to be Magistrates while having been given leave to hold the offices of Registrar or Principal Registrar as the case may be.

PART 2: TRAVELLING AND ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCE

- 2.1 When an overnight stay away from home is involved, a travelling and accommodation allowance (inclusive of accommodation, meals and incidentals) shall be payable in accordance with the relevant Australian Taxation Office reasonable benefit limit applicable from time to time and when accompanied by certification that the expense was appropriately incurred.

- 2.2 If reasonably and properly incurred travelling and accommodation expenses exceed the rate specified in 2.1, then actual costs should be reimbursed. Receipts or vouchers must be provided in support of any claim for reimbursement in excess of the specified rate.
- 2.3 Claims for overnight stays in the Perth metropolitan area should be subject in each case to the approval of the relevant chief judicial officer.
- 2.4 Part payment of travelling and accommodation allowances shall apply in the following circumstances:
- a. when the Judge, Master or Magistrate is accommodated in private, non-commercial accommodation, such as the home of a family member or friend, a rate of one third of the specified rate shall be payable
 - b. when the cost of commercial accommodation is met by an entity other than the Judge, Master or Magistrate, an allowance shall be payable in accordance with the relevant Australian Taxation Office reasonable benefit limit for meals and incidentals applicable from time to time and when accompanied by certification that the expense was appropriately incurred
 - c. when in the case of commercial accommodation referred to in 2.4.b above, the cost of a meal or meals is met by an entity other than the Judge, Master or Magistrate, the amount of travelling allowance shall be reduced by the relevant amount(s) referred to in the preceding paragraph.

PART 3: MOTOR VEHICLES

- 3.1 The following arrangements apply or continue to apply, as the case may be, to each Judge, Master and full-time Magistrate for the provision of a fully maintained motor vehicle for business and private use.
- 3.2 All vehicles (being part of the Government-owned State Fleet) should be managed in accordance with the policies and conditions established and amended from time to time by the Department of Housing and Works (the agency responsible for the State Fleet). Applicable terms and conditions are currently set out in the document "State Fleet - General Agreement".
- 3.3 Selection of appropriate vehicles should be subject to consultation between the Department of Justice (as the administering agency responsible for managing the leasing arrangements for vehicles provided to Judges, Masters and full-time Magistrates) and the relevant Court. Although the cost of vehicles is centrally funded, as a consequence of it being a benefit recommended under the Act, the area remains an administrative responsibility of the department to manage in a cost-effective manner.

- 3.4 In providing for the use of a motor vehicle under this arrangement, the Tribunal requires that office holders and the department will take account of the following principles established by the Tribunal. The provision of a motor vehicle should:
- meet the operational conveyance needs of the Judiciary
 - provide for adequate safety and security of judicial office holders
 - be representative of fair value and benefit
 - be supportive of the efficient, effective and ethical use of State resources
 - be consistent with current principles of environmental sustainability, in particular, fuel efficiency and government emissions targets
 - although private use of a vehicle is permitted, personal preference in choice of a motor vehicle should be consistent with the above principles.
- 3.5 For the purposes of determining the annual whole of life cost of the motor vehicle lease relative to the value of the relevant benefit set out in this determination, the lease value shall be based on the whole of life lease over a minimum of two years/40,000 kilometres. The annual whole of life costs and term will be determined at the time of ordering the motor vehicle and will be inclusive of the cost and installation of accessories, as well as removal costs if required, before disposal of the vehicle.
- 3.6 The notional whole of life cost must include the lease cost (based on nominated lifespan and kilometres), Fringe Benefits Tax (FBT) and all other operating costs. The formula to be adopted in valuing the motor vehicle is outlined in table 3.

Table 3: Whole of life cost of a motor vehicle formula

L + R + aD + FBT + I + LCT, where		
L	=	Lease payments
R	=	Registration costs
a	=	Running cost per kilometre
D	=	Nominated annual kilometres
FBT	=	Fringe Benefits Tax
I	=	Insurance
LCT	=	Luxury car tax

- 3.7 FBT is costed at applicable Australian Taxation Office rates. FBT is costed at purchase price (including GST) x statutory fraction x gross up (2.0802) x FBT rate (0.470).
- 3.8 FBT Exempt Agencies: Where an organisation is exempt from FBT in accordance with Commonwealth legislation, a notional amount equal to the standard FBT must be added to the cost of the benefit.

- 3.9 Motor vehicles leased for judicial office holders shall not be changed prior to the expiration of the lease unless it is for operational reasons approved by the relevant chief judicial officer in consultation with the department.
- 3.10 Office holders are encouraged to consider leasing electric vehicles (EVs) as part of their commitment to sustainable transport where the option suits their personal needs. While EVs contribute to environmental objectives and align with broader government commitments to reducing emissions, the preferred recharging method for EVs is at home, overnight charging. The cost of at home charging is significantly lower than that of refuelling an internal combustion vehicle and is not included in the whole of life lease costs of the vehicle.
- 3.11 There is currently no single recharging card solution for all commercially available EV recharging points. If an office holder chooses to recharge the vehicle at a commercial recharger, the cost is to be borne by the office holder. Office based rechargers are being rolled out for other State Fleet vehicles. Office based rechargers must be prioritised for fleet vehicles above personal EVs (including SAT vehicles). If a department introduces a policy, consistent with State Fleet guidelines, the office holder may participate in that policy and be responsible for any costs that it may incur.
- 3.12 Judges, Masters, and full-time Magistrates may choose any vehicle and accessories in the Common Use Arrangement or an “off contract” vehicle and accessories available under Government leasing arrangements, the total cost of which does not exceed the relevant benefit determined in this report. Where the annual whole of life cost of a vehicle and accessories is greater than the relevant benefit, the difference in cost is to be subtracted fortnightly from the office holder’s salary. Salary adjustments are fixed once the office holder commits to a vehicle model and accessory package – regardless of any fluctuations in whole of life costs occurring up to, and post delivery. However, in the event the office holder elects to amend the vehicle lease term (including lease extensions or increased lease kilometres), a salary adjustment review (taking into account the revised whole of life costs) must be undertaken and applied. Vehicle leases must be aligned to actual usage.
- 3.13 In the event a judicial office holder’s motor vehicle requires modifications to cater for a disability, resulting in total vehicle costs higher than the notional lease values specified in table 4, then the reasonable additional cost may be approved by the relevant chief judicial officer in consultation with the department.
- 3.14 In order to contain additional administrative costs associated with “off contract” leases, office holders may request cost quotations for not more than three vehicles outside the Government’s Common Use Arrangement for motor vehicles, in the process of selecting a vehicle under this arrangement.
- 3.15 Each actual lease should be tailored to achieve the most cost-effective arrangement based on individual usage patterns.

- 3.16 Use of an off-road vehicle must be substantiated by operational need and must be approved by the chief judicial officer. Off-road vehicles shall be of a standard, the cost of which does not exceed the whole of life notional lease cost of the Toyota Prado GXL fitted with “roo” bar (air bag compliant) or the relevant benefit specified in table 4, whichever is higher. This includes the purchase cost of other essential accessories approved by the relevant chief judicial officer.
- 3.17 While the vehicle may be used anywhere in Western Australia at no cost to the individual, if the vehicle is driven interstate, the individual is liable for the cost of fuel and oil or recharging while interstate. Furthermore, if used outside of Western Australia, the custodian must be in the vehicle at all times that it is being used. However, for the Magistrate residing in Kununurra, use of the government-provided vehicle is permitted to and from the Northern Territory for periods of usage up to seven days under the same conditions as if the vehicle were in Western Australia. Under the State Fleet – General Agreement, other office holders are required to seek approval from State Fleet for travel outside Western Australia for periods of seven days or more.
- 3.18 Office holders are entitled to the provision of a vehicle with an annual whole of life cost for the vehicle (including accessories) as stated in table 4.

Table 4: Motor vehicle benefit

Position	Annual Benefit
Chief Justice	\$29,000
Judges, Masters and the Chief Magistrate	\$28,500
Full time Magistrates	\$27,900

- 3.19 When a Magistrate is employed on a part time basis, or an Acting Magistrate is employed for less than two years, the pro rata amount as stated in table 5 should be added to their remuneration in lieu of a motor vehicle.

Table 5: Pro-rata motor vehicle annual benefit

Position	Pro rata Annual Benefit
Part time Magistrates	\$27,900
Acting Magistrates	\$27,900

Signed on 3 October 2025

E Prof M Seares AO
CHAIR

Dr M Schaper
MEMBER

O Whittle
MEMBER

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL