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INTRODUCTION

This policy replaces the Director of Military Prosecution's (DMP) previous policy of 5 September 2013.

The policy applies to all prosecutors posted to the Office of the Director of Military Prosecutions (ODMP), any legal officer to whom DMP has delegated function(s) under Defence Force Discipline Act 1982 (DFDA) s 188GR and any ADF legal officer who has been briefed to advise DMP or to represent DMP in a prosecution before a Defence Force magistrate (DFM), a restricted court martial (RCM) or a general court martial (GCM), or to represent DMP in the Defence Force Discipline Appeal Tribunal (DFDAT) or another court.

In order to promote consistency between Commonwealth prosecution authorities, some aspects of this policy are modelled on relevant Commonwealth policies.

This publication of policy and guidelines will be periodically updated to ensure that it continues to incorporate changes to the law and Defence policy. The aims of this policy are to:

a. provide guidance for prosecutors to assist in ensuring the quality and consistency of their recommendations and decisions; and

b. to inform other ADF members and the public of the principles which guide decisions made by the DMP.

Members of the ADF are subject to the DFDA in addition to the ordinary criminal law of the Commonwealth, States and Territories. Decisions in respect of the prosecution of offences can arise at various stages and encompass the initial decision whether or not to prosecute, the decision as to what charges should be laid and whether a prosecution should be continued.
The initial decision of whether or not to prosecute is the most significant step in the prosecution process. It is therefore important that the decision to prosecute (or not) be made fairly and for appropriate reasons. It is also important that care is taken in the selection of the charges that are to be laid. In short, decisions made in respect of the prosecution of service offences under the DFDA must be capable of withstanding scrutiny. Finally, it is in the interests of all that decisions in respect of DFDA prosecutions are made expeditiously.

The purpose of a prosecution under the DFDA is not to obtain a conviction; it is to lay before a service tribunal what the prosecution considers to be credible evidence relevant to what is alleged to be a service offence. A prosecutor represents the service community: as Deane J has observed, he or she must “act with fairness and detachment and always with the objectives of establishing the whole truth in accordance with the procedures and standards which the law requires to be observed and of helping to ensure that the accused's trial is a fair one”.

Although the role of the prosecutor excludes any notion of winning or losing, the prosecutor is entitled to present the prosecution’s case firmly, fearlessly and vigorously, with, it has been said “an ingrained sense of the dignity, the seriousness and the justness of judicial proceedings”.

This policy is not intended to cover every conceivable situation which may be encountered during the prosecution process. Prosecutors must seek to resolve a wide range of issues with judgment, sensitivity and common sense. It is neither practicable nor desirable too closely to fetter the prosecutor’s discretion as to the manner in which the dictates of justice and fairness may best be served in every case.
1. THE DECISION TO PROSECUTE

1.1 Factors governing the decision to prosecute

The prosecution process normally commences with a suspicion, an allegation or a confession. However, not every suspicion, allegation or confession will automatically result in a prosecution. The fundamental question is whether or not the public interest requires that a particular matter be prosecuted. In respect of prosecutions under the DFDA, the public interest is defined primarily in terms of the requirement to maintain a high standard of discipline in the ADF.

The criteria for exercising the discretion to prosecute cannot be reduced to a mathematical formula. Indeed, the breadth of factors to be considered in exercising the discretion reinforces the importance of judgment and the need to tailor general principles to individual cases.

The decision to prosecute can be understood as a two-stage process. First, does the evidence offer reasonable prospects of conviction? If so, is it in the service interest to proceed with a prosecution taking into account the effect of any decision to prosecute on the maintenance of discipline in the ADF.

1.2 Admissible evidence and reasonable prospect of conviction

The initial consideration will be the adequacy of the evidence and whether or not the admissible evidence available is capable of establishing each element of the offence. A prosecution should not be instituted or continued unless there is reliable evidence, duly admissible before a service tribunal, that a service offence has been committed by the person accused. This consideration is not confined to a technical appraisal of whether the evidence is sufficient to constitute a prima facie case. The evidence must provide reasonable prospects of a conviction.
The decision as to whether there is a reasonable prospect of a conviction requires an evaluation of how strong the case is likely to be when presented in Court. It must take into account such matters as the availability, competence and credibility of witnesses and their likely impression on the arbiter of fact. The prosecutor should also have regard to any lines of defence which are plainly open to or have been indicated by the accused, and any other factors which are properly to be taken into account and could affect the likelihood of a conviction.

The factors which need to be considered will depend upon the circumstances of each individual case. Without purporting to be exhaustive they may include the following:

a. Are the witnesses available and competent to give evidence?

b. Do the witnesses appear to be honest and reliable?

c. Do any of the witnesses appear to be exaggerating, defective in memory, unfavourable or friendly towards the accused, or otherwise unreliable?

d. Do any of the witnesses have a motive for being less than candid or to lie?

e. Are there any matters which may properly form the basis for an attack upon the credibility of a witness?

f. What impressions are the witnesses likely to make in court, and how is each likely to cope with cross-examination?

g. If there is any conflict between witnesses, does it go beyond what might be expected; does it give rise to any suspicion that one or both versions may have been concocted; or conversely are the versions so identical that collusion should be suspected?
h. Are there any grounds for believing that relevant evidence is likely to be excluded as legally inadmissible or as a result of some recognised judicial discretion?

i. Where the case is largely dependent upon admissions made by the accused, are there grounds for suspecting that they may be unreliable given the surrounding circumstances?

i. If identity is likely to be an issue, is the evidence that it was the accused who committed the offence sufficiently cogent and reliable?

j. Where more than one accused are to be tried together, is there sufficient evidence to prove the case against each of them?

If the assessment leads to the conclusion that there are reasonable prospects of a conviction, consideration must then be given as to whether it is in the service interest that the prosecution should proceed.

1.3 Maintenance of discipline/Service Interest

It is critical that the ADF establish and maintain the high standard of discipline that is necessary for it to conduct successful operations. As the ADF may be required to operate at short notice in a conflict situation, a common and high standard of discipline must be maintained at all times. Discipline is achieved and maintained by many means, including leadership, training and the use of administrative sanctions. Prosecution of charges under the DFDA is a particularly important means of maintaining discipline in the ADF. Indeed, the primary purpose of the disciplinary provisions of the DFDA is to assist in the establishment and maintenance of a high level of service discipline.
The High Court of Australia, through a number of decisions, has explained the limits of the ADF discipline jurisdiction. Specifically, the High Court has decided that service offences should only be prosecuted where such proceedings can be reasonably regarded as substantially serving the purpose of maintaining or enforcing service discipline.

In many cases the requirement to maintain service discipline will be reason enough to justify a decision to lay charges under the DFDA. However, occasionally wider public interest considerations, beyond those relating to the maintenance of discipline in the ADF, will warrant civil criminal charges being laid.

Although it is a matter for the DMP to determine when the prosecution of a matter will substantially serve the purpose of maintaining service discipline, the DFDA provides at s 5A for the appointment of superior authorities to represent the interests of the service in relation to matters referred to the DMP. Where charges are being considered by the DMP, the DMP will usually canvass the views of the relevant superior authority in writing. Such a request will outline the alleged offending and detail the proposed charges. For the purpose of DFDA section 5A, relevant ADF interests may include:

- a. unit operational or exercise commitments which may affect the timing of any trial of the charges;
- b. issues concerning the availability of the accused person and/or witnesses due to operational, exercise or other commitments;
- c. any severe time constraints or resource implications;
- d. wider morale implications within a command and the wider ADF;
- e. potential operational security disclosure issues;
f. the anticipation of media interest;

g. the prior conduct of the accused person, including findings of any administrative inquiries concerning the accused person’s conduct; and

h. whether or not there is a need to send a message of deterrence, both to the accused person (specific deterrence) and to other members of the ADF (general deterrence).

It would not be appropriate for a Superior Authority to express views on whether particular charges should be laid or the legal merits of the case. Issues of maintaining discipline and Service interests will vary in each particular case but may include the following.

a. **Operational requirements.** Only in the most exceptional cases will operational requirements justify a decision not to lay or proceed with a charge under the DFDA. In particular, the existence of a situation of active service will not, by itself, justify a decision not to charge or proceed with a charge under the DFDA. In most cases, operational considerations will only result in delay in dealing with charges. Operational requirements may, however, be relevant in deciding to which level of service tribunal charges should be referred.

b. **Prior conduct.** The existence of prior convictions, or the general prior conduct of an offender, may be a relevant consideration. For example, several recent infringement notices for related conduct may justify a decision to charge a member with a Service offence under the DFDA notwithstanding that the latest offence, when viewed in isolation, would not normally warrant such action.
c. **Effect upon morale.** The positive and negative effects upon ADF morale, both generally and in respect of a part of the ADF, may be a relevant consideration.

### 1.4 Alternatives to charging

Laying charges under the DFDA is only one tool that is available to establish and maintain discipline. In some circumstances, maintenance of discipline will best be achieved by taking administrative action against members in accordance with Defence Instructions, as an alternative to or in conjunction with disciplinary proceedings. Similarly, in respect of minor breaches of discipline, proceedings before a Discipline Officer may be appropriate. The DMP may be asked to advise on matters that can be appropriately dealt with through administrative or Discipline Officer action.

While the DMP may make such recommendations, ultimate decisions in respect of how these breaches are dealt with still rests with commanders, who in turn apply judgement to the unique facts and circumstances of the case before them. Nevertheless, administrative or Discipline Officer action alone is inappropriate to deal with situations in which a serious breach of discipline has occurred or where the conduct involved is otherwise deemed to be serious enough to warrant the laying of charges under the DFDA. Further, in some cases the interests of justice may require that a matter be resolved publicly by proceedings under the DFDA before a Defence Force magistrate, restricted court martial or general court martial.

Alternatives to charging should never be used as a means of avoiding charges in situations in which formal disciplinary action is appropriate.

### 1.5 Discretionary factors

Having determined there is sufficient reliable and admissible evidence for a reasonable prospect of conviction there are
numerous discretionary factors which are relevant in deciding whether to commence (or continue with) a prosecution under the DFDA. In particular, the following is a non-exhaustive list of factors that DMP may consider in deciding, in a given case, whether charges under the DFDA should be preferred or proceeded with:

a. **Consistency and fairness.** The decision to prosecute should be exercised consistently and fairly with similar cases being dealt with in a similar way. However, it must always be recognised that no two cases are identical and there is always a requirement to consider the unique circumstances and facts of each case before deciding whether to prosecute.

b. **Deterrence.** In appropriate cases, such as where a specific offence has become prevalent or where there is a requirement to reinforce standards, regard may be paid to the need to send a message of deterrence, both to the alleged offender and the ADF generally.

c. **Seriousness of the offence.** It will always be relevant to consider the seriousness of the alleged offence. A decision not to charge under the DFDA may be justified in circumstances in which a technical and/or trivial breach of the DFDA has been committed (provided of course that no significant impact upon discipline will result from a decision not to proceed). In these circumstances, administrative action or Discipline Officer proceedings may be a more appropriate mechanism for dealing with the matter. In contrast and as a general rule, the more serious and wilful the alleged conduct giving rise to a service offence, the more appropriate it will be to prefer charges under the DFDA.
d. **Interests of the complainant.** In respect of offences against the person of another, the effect upon that other person of proceeding or not proceeding with a charge will always be a relevant consideration. Similarly, in appropriate cases regard may need to be paid to the wishes of the other person in deciding whether charges should be laid, although such considerations are not determinative.

e. **Nature of the offender.** The age, intelligence, physical or mental health, cooperativeness and level of service experience of the alleged offender may be relevant considerations. For example, in situations where an accused is about to be discharged from the ADF for mental health reasons, the issues of deterrence and maintenance of discipline would carry less weight in the decision to prosecute.

f. **Degree of culpability.** Occasionally an incident, such as some accidents, will be caused by the combined actions of many people and cannot be directly attributed to the conduct of one or more persons. In these circumstances, careful regard must be paid to the degree of culpability of the individuals involved when deciding whether charges should be laid and against whom.

g. **Delay in dealing with matters.** Occasionally, conduct giving rise to possible service offences will not be detected for some time. Where service offences are not statute barred under the DFDA, it may nevertheless be relevant to consider whether the length of time since the alleged offence was committed militates against charges being laid. In considering this aspect, the sufficiency of the evidence, the discipline purposes to be served in proceeding with charges and any potential...
deterioration in the ability to accord an accused person a fair trial are likely to be particularly relevant.

h. The member's discharge from the ADF. Once a member has discharged from the ADF, charges must be preferred within 6 months, and only if the offence carries a maximum penalty of more than 2 years civil imprisonment. In relation to serious matters, consideration will be given to referring the matter to civil authorities for prosecution.

Defending Officers may make written representations to the DMP about discretionary factors to be considered and also the extent to which proceedings can reasonably be regarded as substantially serving the purpose of maintaining or enforcing service discipline although if circumstances have not changed markedly since the original prosecution decision was made, or they refer only to matters that have already been considered, it is unlikely to result in a change of decision.

1.6 Discontinuing a prosecution

Generally the considerations relevant to the decision to prosecute set out above will also be relevant to the decision to discontinue a prosecution. The final decision as to whether a prosecution proceeds rests with the DMP. However, wherever practicable, the views of the service police (or other referring agency) and the views of the complainant will be sought and taken into account in making that decision.

Of course, the extent of that consultation will depend on the circumstances of the case in question, and in particular on the reasons why the DMP is contemplating discontinuing the prosecution. It will be for the DMP to decide on the sufficiency of evidence. On the other hand, if discontinuance on service interest grounds is contemplated, the views of the service police or other referring agency, and the views of the complainant will have greater relevance.
2. FACTORS THAT ARE NOT TO INFLENCE THE DECISION TO PROSECUTE

Although not exhaustive, the following factors are \textit{never} considered when exercising the discretion to prosecute or proceed with charges under the DFDA:

a. The race, religion, sex, sexual preference, marital status, national origin, political associations, activities or beliefs, or Service of the alleged offender or any other person involved.

b. Personal feelings concerning the offender or any other person involved.

c. Possible personal advantage or disadvantage that may result from the prosecution of a person.

d. The possible effect of any decision upon the Service career of the person exercising the discretion to prosecute.

e. Any purported direction from higher authority in respect of a specific case, whether implicit, explicit or by way of inducement or threat.

f. Possible embarrassment or adverse publicity to a command, a unit or formation, the wider ADF or Government.

\textbf{g. In relation to members of the Permanent Navy, Australian Regular Army or Permanent Air Force, or members of the Reserve rendering continuous full time service, the availability (or otherwise) of victims of crime compensation in the State or Territory where the alleged offending occurred.}
Finally, no person has a 'right' to be tried under the DFDA. Accordingly, a request by a member that he or she be tried in order to 'clear his or her name', is not a relevant consideration in deciding whether charges under the DFDA should be laid or proceeded with.
3. CHOICE OF CHARGES

In many cases the evidence will disclose conduct which constitutes an offence against several different laws. Care must be taken to choose charges which adequately reflect the nature and extent of the offending conduct disclosed by the evidence and which will enable the court to impose a sentence commensurate with the gravity of the conduct. It will not normally be appropriate to charge a person with a number of offences in respect of the one act but in some circumstances it may be necessary to lay charges in the alternative.

The charges laid will usually be the most serious available on the evidence. However, it is necessary to make an overall appraisal of such factors as the strength of the evidence, the probable lines of defence to a particular charge and whether or not trial on indictment is the only means of disposal. Such an appraisal may sometimes lead to the conclusion that it would be appropriate to proceed with some other charge or charges.

The provisions of the DFDA must be relied upon in preference to the use of territory offences from the provisions of the Crimes Act 1914, Crimes Act 1900 or the Criminal Codes unless such a course would not adequately reflect the gravity of the conduct disclosed by the evidence. Territory offences are limited in their application to ADF members by ordinary rules of statutory interpretation. In particular, where any allegedly offending conduct of an ADF member is covered by both a territory offence and an offence under the DFDA, the general provision in a statute yields to the specific provision. This was confirmed by the Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia in Hoffman v Chief of Army (2004) 137 FCR 520. The case provides that the question of whether a general territory offence will be excluded by a specific non-territory offence, or vice versa, is to be determined on a case-by-case basis, having regard to the purposes of the provisions under consideration, and the differences between the elements and seriousness of the offences.

Under no circumstances should charges be laid with the intention of providing scope for subsequent charge negotiation.
4. MODE OF TRIAL

The DMP may deem it appropriate to have regard to the following additional factors when deciding which service tribunal should deal with specific charges:

a. **Sentencing options.** The adequacy of the sentencing powers that are available at the various levels of service tribunal will always be an important consideration in deciding by which service tribunal charges should be tried.

b. **Cost.** For service offences or breaches of discipline, cost may be a relevant consideration in deciding what level of service tribunal should be used.

c. **Discretion to decide that an offence be tried by Defence Force magistrate, restricted court martial or general court martial.** Sections 103(1)(c) & (d) of the DFDA provide the DMP with the discretion to decide that an offence be tried by a Defence Force magistrate (DFM), a restricted court martial (RCM) or a general court martial (GCM). In making such a determination, and in addition to a careful consideration of the individual circumstances of the alleged offence(s) in the Brief of Evidence, the DMP may consider:

1. the objective seriousness of the alleged offence(s);
2. whether like charges would ordinarily be tried in the absence of a jury in the civilian courts in Australia;
3. whether the nature of the alleged conduct has a particular service context that relates to the performance of duty and may be best
considered by a number of officers with general service experience;

(4) whether the scale of punishment available would enable the accused person, if convicted, to be appropriately punished;

(5) the prior convictions of the alleged offender

d. **Victims compensation schemes.** In relation to members of the Reserve forces and civilians who are alleged victims of violent offences, the availability of civilian victims of crime compensation may be a relevant consideration in determining whether the matter is prosecuted under the DFDA or referred to a civilian prosecution authority for disposal.
5.  DELAY

Avoiding unnecessary delay in bringing matters to trial is a fundamental obligation of prosecutors. Accordingly all prosecutors should:

a. prepare a brief for the DMP with a proposed course of action for the disposal of the matter promptly;

b. when recommending prosecution, draft charges for approval of the DMP and arrange for delivery of the charge documentation to the accused as soon as possible;

c. balance requests for further investigation of the matter with the need to bring the matter to trial in a timely fashion; and

d. remain in contact with witnesses and ascertain their availability for attendance at trial as soon as practical.
6. SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE OFFICE

The Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office (SeMPRO) was established on 23 July 2013. SeMPRO is focused on providing support, advice and guidance to ADF members who have been affected by sexual misconduct. SeMPRO also provides advice and guidance to commanders and managers of persons affected by sexual misconduct to assist them in appropriately managing the reported incident.

Although there is no formal operational relationship between the office of the DMP, and SeMPRO there is a clear benefit in ensuring that the office of the DMP supports SeMPRO objectives.

To that end, the staff of the office of the DMP may assist SeMPRO in dealing with matters of alleged sexual misconduct, regardless of the decision to lay charges or not. This includes:

a. **informing** victims of the role and availability of SeMPRO in order to invite any victim to report the instance of alleged sexual misconduct to SeMPRO to assist SeMPRO with its reporting, prevalence and trend analysis functions,

b. **liaising** (if the victim consents to that liaison) with SeMPRO staff to assist them in ensuring that victims of sexual misconduct are kept informed throughout the prosecution process and fully supported by SeMPRO staff during the prosecution process; and

c. **reporting** (in accordance with the privacy laws) instances of alleged sexual misconduct (even when not ultimately prosecuted) and the results of trials involving alleged sexual misconduct to assist SeMPRO to identify causative or contributory factors and in its education and reporting functions.
7. DISCLOSURE

It is an important part of the ADF disciplinary system that prosecutions be conducted fairly, transparently, and according to the highest ethical standards. It is a long standing tenet of the Australian criminal justice system that an accused person is entitled to know the case that is to be made against him or her, so that the accused person is able to properly defend the charges. An accused person is entitled to know the evidence that is to be brought in support of the charges as part of the prosecution case, and also whether there is any other material which may be relevant to the defence of the charges. This right imposes an obligation of ‘disclosure’ on the prosecution.

7.1 What is ‘disclosure’?

‘Disclosure’ requires the prosecution to inform the accused of:

a. the prosecution’s case against him/her;

b. any information in relation to the credibility or reliability of the prosecution witnesses; and

c. any unused material

The obligation is a continuing one (even during the appeal process) requiring the prosecution to make full disclosure to the accused in a timely manner of all material known to the prosecution which can be seen on a sensible appraisal by the prosecution:

a. to be relevant or possibly relevant to an issue in the case;

b. to raise or possibly raise a new issue whose existence is not apparent from the evidence the prosecution proposes to use; or

c. to hold out a real as opposed to fanciful prospect of providing a lead to evidence which goes to either of the previous two matters.
The prosecution will disclose to the accused all material it possesses which is relevant to the charge(s) against the accused which has been gathered in the course of the investigation (or during the proofing of witnesses) and which:

a. the prosecution does not intend to rely on as part of its case, and
b. either is exculpatory or runs counter to the prosecution case (i.e. points away from the accused having committed the offence) or might reasonably be expected to assist the accused in advancing a defence, including material which is in the possession of a third party.

The prosecution duty of disclosure does not extend to disclosing material:

a. relevant only to the credibility of defence (as distinct from prosecution) witnesses;
b. relevant only to the credibility of the accused;
c. relevant only because it might deter an accused from giving false evidence or raising an issue of fact which might be shown to be false; or
d. for the purpose of preventing an accused from creating a forensic disadvantage for himself or herself, if at the time the prosecution became aware of the material, it was not seen as relevant to an issue in the case or otherwise disclosable.

The duty on the prosecution to disclose material to the accused imposes a concomitant obligation on the service police / investigators to notify the prosecution of the existence of all other documentation, material and other information, including that which concerns any proposed witnesses, which might be of relevance to either the prosecution or the defence. If required, in addition to providing the brief of evidence, the service police / investigators shall certify that the prosecution has been notified
of the existence of all such material. Such material includes statements made by witnesses that have not been signed.

Subject to public interest immunity considerations, such material, if assessed as relevant according the criteria identified above, should be disclosed.

Where a prosecutor receives material / information that may possibly be subject to a claim of public interest immunity, the prosecutor should not disclose the material without first consulting with the service police/investigators, and where appropriate, Defence Legal. The purpose of the consultation is to give the service police/investigators the opportunity to make a claim of immunity if they consider it appropriate.

The prosecution must not disclose counselling files relating to complainants in sexual offence proceedings, unless the court otherwise orders. In this regard it is relevant to note the provisions of Division 4.5 of the Evidence (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1991 relating to protected confidence material.

7.2 Unused material

"Unused material" is all information relevant to the charge/s against the accused which has been gathered in the course of the investigation and which the prosecution does not intend to rely on as part of its case, and either runs counter to the prosecution case (i.e. points away from the accused having committed the alleged offence(s)) or might reasonably be expected to assist the accused in advancing a defence, including material which is in the possession of a third party (i.e. a person or body other than the investigation agency or the prosecution).

The prosecution should disclose to the defence all unused material in its possession unless:

a. it is considered that the material is immune from disclosure on public interest grounds;
b. disclosure of the material is precluded by statute, or

c. it is considered that legal professional privilege should be claimed in respect of the material.

Where disclosure is withheld on public interest grounds the defence is to be informed of this and the basis of the claim in general terms (for example that it would disclose the identity of an informant or the location of a premises used for surveillance) unless to do so would in effect reveal that which it would not be in the public interest to reveal.

In some instances it may be appropriate to delay rather than withhold disclosure, for example if disclosure would prejudice ongoing investigations. Disclosure could be delayed until after the investigations are complete.

Legal professional privilege will ordinarily be claimed against the production of any document in the nature of an internal DPP advice or opinion. Legal professional privilege will not be claimed in respect of any record of a statement by a witness that is inconsistent with that witness’s previous statement or adds to it significantly, including any statement made in conference, provided the disclosure of such records serves a legitimate forensic purpose.

The requirement to disclose unused material continues throughout a prosecution. If the prosecution becomes aware of the existence of unused material during the course of a prosecution which has not been disclosed, that material should be disclosed as soon as reasonably possible.

Where feasible the accused should be provided with copies of the unused material. If this is not feasible (for example because of the bulk of the material) the accused should be provided with a schedule listing the unused material, with a description making clear the nature of that material, at the time the brief of
evidence is served. The defence should then be informed that arrangements may be made to inspect the material.

If the prosecution has a statement from a person who can give material evidence but who will not be called because they are not credible, the defence should be provided with the name and address of the person and, ordinarily, a copy of the statement.

Where the prosecution is aware that material which runs counter to the prosecution case or might reasonably be expected to assist the accused is in the possession of a third party, the defence should be informed of:

a. the name of the third party;

b. the nature of the material; and

c. the address of the third party (unless there is good reason for not doing so and if so, it may be necessary for the prosecutor to facilitate communication between the defence and the third party.)

There may be cases where, having regard to:

a. the absence of information available to the prosecutor as to the lines of defence to be pursued, and/or

b. the nature, extent or complexity of the material gathered in the course of the investigation,

there will be difficulty in accurately assessing whether particular material satisfies the description of unused material. In these cases, after consultation with the relevant investigating agency, the prosecutor may permit the defence to inspect such material.
7.3 Disclosure affecting credibility and/or reliability of a prosecution witness

The prosecution is also under a duty to disclose to the accused information in its possession which is relevant to the credibility or reliability of a prosecution witness, for example:

a. a relevant previous conviction or finding of guilt;

b. a statement made by a witness, whether signed or unsigned, which is inconsistent with any prior statement of the witness;

c. a relevant adverse finding in other criminal proceedings or in non-criminal proceedings;

d. any physical or mental condition which may affect reliability;

e. any concession which has been granted to the witness in order to secure the witness’s testimony for the prosecution.

Previous convictions

It is not possible for the service police to conduct criminal checks for all prosecution witnesses. Prosecutors should only request a criminal history check for a prosecution witness where there is reason to believe that the credibility of the prosecution witness may be in issue.

While the duty to disclose to the accused the previous convictions of a prosecution witness extends only to relevant prior convictions, a prior conviction recorded against a prosecution witness should be disclosed unless the prosecutor is satisfied that the conviction could not reasonably be seen to affect credibility having regard to the nature of, and anticipated issues in, the case. In that regard, previous convictions for offences involving dishonesty should always be disclosed.

The accused may request that the prosecution provide details of any criminal convictions recorded against a prosecution witness. Such a request should be complied with where the prosecutor is
satisfied that the defence has a legitimate forensic purpose for obtaining this information, such as where there is a reason to know or suspect that a witness has prior convictions.
8. CHARGE NEGOTIATION

Charge-negotiation involves communications between an accused person via his/her defending officer and the DMP in relation to charges to be proceeded with. Such negotiations may result in the accused person pleading guilty to fewer than all of the charges he/she is facing, or to a lesser charge or charges, with the remaining charges either not being proceeded with or taken into account without proceeding to conviction.

The DMP is the sole authority to accept or negotiate offers made by an accused person who is to be tried by a DFM, RCM or GCM. A legal officer who prosecutes on DMP’s behalf must seek DMP’s instructions prior to accepting an offer made in these charge-negotiations.

Charge-negotiations are to be distinguished from consultations with a service tribunal as to the punishment the service tribunal would be likely to impose in the event of the accused pleading guilty to a service offence. No legal officer prosecuting on behalf of the DMP is to participate in such a consultation.

Nevertheless, arrangements as to charge or charges and plea can be consistent with the requirements of justice subject to the following constraints:

a. any charge-negotiation proposal must not be initiated by the prosecution; and

b. such a proposal should not be entertained by the prosecution unless:

(1) the charges to be proceeded with bear a reasonable relationship to the nature of the misconduct of the accused;
(2) those charges provide an adequate basis for an appropriate sentence in all the circumstances of the case; and

(3) there is evidence to support the charges.

Any decision by DMP whether or not to agree to a proposal advanced by the accused person, or to put a counter-proposal to the accused person, will take into account all the circumstances of the case and other relevant considerations, including:

a. whether the accused person is willing to cooperate in the investigation or prosecution of others, or the extent to which the accused person has done so;

b. whether the sentence that is likely to be imposed if the charges are varied as proposed (taking into account such matters as whether the accused is already serving a term of imprisonment) would be appropriate for the misconduct involved;

c. the desirability of prompt and certain dispatch of the case;

d. the accused person’s antecedent conduct;

e. the strength of the prosecution case;

f. the likelihood of adverse consequences to witnesses;

g. in cases where there has been a financial loss to the Commonwealth or any person, whether the accused person has made restitution or reparation or arrangements for either;

h. the need to avoid delay in the dispatch of other pending cases;
i. the time and expense involved in a trial and any appeal proceedings; and

j. the views of the victim(s) and/or complainant(s), where this is reasonably practicable to obtain.

The proposed charge(s) should be discussed with any complainant(s) and where appropriate an explanation of the rationale for an acceptance of the plea ought to be explained. The views of the complainant will be relevant and need to be weighed by the decision maker but are not binding on the DMP.

In no circumstances will the DMP entertain charge-negotiation proposals initiated by the defending officer if the accused person maintains his or her innocence with respect to a charge or charges to which the accused person has offered to plead guilty.

A proposal by the Defending Officer that a plea of guilty be accepted to a lesser number of charges or a lesser charge or charges may include a request that the proposed charges be dealt with summarily, for example before a Commanding Officer.

A proposal by the Defending Officer that a plea of guilty be accepted to a lesser number of charges or to a lesser charge or charges may include a request that the prosecution not oppose a submission to the court during sentencing that the particular penalty falls within a nominated range. Alternatively, the Defending Officer may indicate that the accused will plead guilty to a statutory or pleaded alternative to the existing charge. DMP may agree to such a request provided the penalty or range of sentence nominated is considered to be within the acceptable limits of an exercise of proper sentencing discretion.
9. IMMUNITIES (UNDEARTAKINGS OF DMP)

Section 188GD vests DMP with the power to give an undertaking to a person that they will not be prosecuted for a service offence in relation to assistance provided to investigators. Essentially, this provision is aimed at securing the assistance of a co-accused or accomplice in circumstances where the disciplinary efficacy of bolstering the prosecution case against the primary accused outweighs the forfeiture of the opportunity to prosecute the person to whom the undertaking is given. The preference is always that a co-accused person willing to assist in the prosecution of another plead guilty and thereafter receive a reduction to their sentence based upon the degree of their cooperation. Such an approach may not always be practicable, however.

In determining whether to grant an undertaking, DMP will consider the following factors.

a. The extent to which the person was involved in the activity giving rise to the charges, compared with the culpability of their accomplice.

b. The strength of the prosecution case against a person in the absence of the evidence arising from the undertaking.

c. The extent to which the testimony of the person receiving the undertaking will bolster the prosecution case, including the weight the trier of fact is likely to attach to such evidence.

d. The likelihood of the prosecution case being supported by means other than evidence from the person given the undertaking.
e. Whether the public interest is to be served by not proceeding with available charges against the person receiving the undertaking.

Details of any undertaking, or of any concession in relation to the selection of charges in light of cooperation with the prosecution, must be disclosed to the service tribunal and to the accused through their Defending Officer.
10. OFFENCES OCCURRING AND/OR PROSECUTED OVERSEAS

In respect of service offences committed or intended to be prosecuted overseas, additional considerations apply. Although jurisdiction under Australian domestic criminal law will rarely exist in such cases, the nation within whose territory an alleged offence has been committed may have a claim to jurisdiction. In such cases a potential conflict of jurisdiction between the DFDA and the foreign nation’s criminal law may arise. In most cases jurisdictional disputes between foreign nations and the ADF will be resolved by reference to foreign visiting forces legislation or Status of Forces Agreements or other similar arrangements.
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