

Case Summary
Office of the Judge Advocate General

DEFENDANT: PTE Williams

TYPE OF PROCEEDING: Defence Force Magistrate

DATE OF TRIAL: 01 December 2025

VENUE: Court Martial Facility, Fyshwick, ACT

Charges and plea

	Statement of Offence	Plea
Charge 1	DFDA, s. 60, Prejudicial conduct	Guilty
Charge 2	DFDA, s. 33(a) Assaulting another person on service land	Guilty
Charge 3	DFDA, s.61(3), and Crimes Act 1900 (ACT), s.60(1) Act of indecency without consent	Not Guilty
Alternative to Charge 3	DFDA, s. 33(a) Assaulting another person on service land	Not Guilty
Charge 4	DFDA, s. 33(a) Assaulting another person on service land	Guilty

Pre-Trial: Closed hearing and non-publication orders

Application made:	No
Determination:	While no orders were made under the DFDA, due to the nature of Charge 3, it is an offence to publish the details of the complainant under the Evidence (Miscellaneous) Provisions Act 1991 (ACT).

Trial: Facts and legal principles

At the start of the case the prosecution replaced Charge 1 with a new Charge of Prejudicial Conduct. They had originally charged him with a more serious offence of Stalking. The prosecution also withdrew a Charge of Assaulting another person on service land.

The defendant pleaded guilty to the amended Charge 1, Charge 2 and 4. He pleaded not guilty to Charge 3 and the alternative. He was acquitted of those Charges after a trial.

Findings

	Finding
Charge 1	Guilty
Charge 2	Guilty
Charge 3	Not Guilty
Alternative to Charge 3	Not Guilty
Charge 4	Guilty

- This summary is not intended to be a substitute for the reasons of the Service tribunal or to be used in any later consideration of the tribunal's reasons.*

Sentencing: Facts and legal principles

The defendant was a recruit at Kapooka, as was the complainant. Charge 1 concerned his harassment of her over a 5 week period. His behaviour towards her was inappropriate, repeatedly harassing, and continued despite intervention from other recruits when the complainant was obviously uncomfortable and distressed.

Charges 2 and 4 concerned assaulting her on two other occasions.

The complainant made disclosures of his behaviour when it became clear he was not going to desist, despite repeated interventions by others. The defendant was aged 24 at the time and must have known he was causing her significant discomfort and alarm by his harassing conduct, yet persisted.

When reported to staff, he was removed from his initial training course. He later completed the course with another Company but then had not gone on to do his intended employment training as a Military Police member due to these charges.

His behaviour was an egregious wilful course of conduct against a female recruit. Despite his length of service, guilty pleas and otherwise good character, the Defence Force magistrate decided his behaviour involved such intentional persistence, by knowingly harassing and assaulting the complainant, that only dismissal from the Defence Force was appropriate.

Punishments and orders

Charge 1	Dismissal
Charge 2	Dismissal
Charge 3	Not Applicable
Alternative to Charge 3	Not Applicable
Charge 4	Dismissal

Outcome on automatic review

The Reviewing Authority's decision on automatic review was handed down on 16 December 2025.

	Conviction	Punishments / Orders
Charge 1	Upheld	Upheld
Charge 2	Upheld	Upheld
Charge 3	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternative to Charge 3	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Charge 4	Upheld	Upheld

- *This summary is not intended to be a substitute for the reasons of the Service tribunal or to be used in any later consideration of the tribunal's reasons.*