The Joys of Early Morning Evidence

Cairns FLPA presentation 25 October 2014

FLA s. 69ZT

Certain provisions of EA do not apply to children's matters

• Divs 3, 4 & 5 of Pt 2.1 contain many usual expectations e.g. party's right to q witnesses, and prohibition on leading qq in EIC

 Parts 3.2-3.8 are quite broad ranging eg hearsay, lay opinion and ev as to a W's credibility

s. 69ZT cont'd

 Can apply one or more of provisions to an issue, but tendency to make broad order

Need exceptional circs ++

• Exceptional circs hard to define: Khalil [2012] FamCAFC 68

 Growing no. of cases suggest sex abuse claim exceptional: Maluka [2012] FamCA 373, Benton [2014] FamCA 251

s.69ZT cont'd

 Either way, weight to be given to ev up to Ct (so what's all the fuss about???)

 NB s. 69V – even if rule ag hearsay applies, child's representations still admissible

s. 69ZT cont'd

Most applications re s. 69ZT at first day of trial

Parties should know before trial material prepared

Difficulties in 69ZT(3)(b) criteria being considered too early

Maybe safest course in sex cases to apply rules of ev

EA s. 128

Allows certificate in relation to self- incriminating evidence

Starting point is <u>objection</u> to giving evidence

Extends to offences and civil penalty

Arguably contravention may lead to civil penalty

Certificate only if court requires giving of evidence

Test is interests of justice

Certificate doesn't protect persons other than the witness

Differing judicial practices as to how orders framed

Can a certificate apply to affidavit EIC?

• Ferrall & Blyton (2000) 27 FLR 178 says can

• High Court doubts in Cornwall v R (2007) 231 CLR 260

• NSW CA doubts in Song v Ying [2010] NSWCA 237

Young J prefers Song v Ying in Aitken & Murphy [2011]
FamCA 785

FCt doesn't deal with problem in Jarvis & Pike [2013]
FamCAFC 196

• I held bound by *Ferrall* in *C & R* [2014] FamCA 848 but prefer reasoning of NSW CA if not bound

How apply in advance for certificate?

Appln for cert, but affidavit needs careful drafting

Cert necessarily would be wrt a topic, not actual evidence

CPA s. 186

• Ev of identity of CP notifier MUST NOT be given w/o leave

• W MUST NOT be asked q that might identify notifier

- No leave unless ev of critical importance AND compelling reason in public interest
- Or notifier agrees

CPA s. 186 cont'd

 In some cases if parent/family member notifier, may be critically important

 Problem is with compelling reason in the public interest ie., is potential harm to child sufficient? How grave does that risk have to be to satisfy the test?

FLA s. 69ZK and 69 ZW also relevant, but State law applies NT v GPAO (1999) 196 CLR 553 (by s.79 Judiciary Act)