caxton legal centre inc.

unlocking the law

30 June 2006

CMC Review of Public Nuisance
Attention: Mr Derran Moss
GPO Box 3123
BRISBANE QLD 4001

By facsimile and post

Dear Derran

Submission to review

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the issues paper in relation to the public nuisance provision.

Please find ***enclosed*** our submission.

Please do not hesitate to telephone me on 3254 1811 if I can be of further assistance.

Yours faithfully

Cristy Dieckmann
Acting Director

CMC CLASSIFICATION

( ) Highly Protected
( ) Protected
( ) In-Confidence
( ) Unclassified

Initials:..... .....
Date...../...../.....
Reg No:.....

abn 57 035 448 677

28 heal st new farm qld 4005
ph: 07 3254 1811 fax: 07 3254 1356 email: caxton@lrvnet.org.au web: www.caxton.org.au

CAXTON LEGAL CENTRE

SUBMISSION TO CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMISSION

The new public nuisance offence provision

June 2006

CONTENTS

APPENDICES

BACKGROUND

Caxton Legal Centre Inc

Established in 1976, Caxton Legal Centre Inc (Caxton) is Queensland's oldest community legal centre. Caxton's mission statement is to 'open the doors of justice by unlocking the law'. Each year Caxton provides free legal services to approximately 12,000 clients including more than 5,000 advices.

In its day-to-day business, Caxton:

- provides free legal advice and conducts casework;
- provides social work support;
- provides community legal education;
- publishes the *Queensland Law Handbook* and other publications; and
- undertakes law reform activities including submissions, lobbying and test case litigation.

The Centre employs 11 effective full time staff (including five solicitors and two social workers). The majority of our direct client services are provided by more than 200 volunteer solicitors, barristers, trainee solicitors and law students.

Expertise in public space law

Caxton's clients are predominantly those who experience disadvantage in their access to the law. As such, we see many clients who are affected by poverty. In the past 3 months, approximately 50% of clients have identified their income as being "low" rather than "medium" or "high" and approximately 35% of clients have identified their income source as government benefits or a pension of some kind.

Disadvantaged members of society (particularly those who are homeless) necessarily use public space for a greater portion of their lives than does the average person and it is in this light that we write this submission.

Caxton has been a member of the Rights in Public Space Action Group (RIPS) since its inception in 2003 and as such, has had an intense association with the issues surrounding the public nuisance provision in the *Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Act* and in the *Summary Offences Act*. As a member of RIPS, Caxton again endorses the submission made by that group when the *Summary Offences Bill* was in its preparatory stage. That submission has been relied on very heavily in drafting this response though we have not formally referenced that document.

Methodology for this submission

In preparing this submission, all Centre advices and files that involved a charge of public nuisance between the period of 1 April 2004 and 1 October 2005 were audited and reviewed. This totalled 16 separate incidents.

It is noted that the numbers of clients with public nuisance charges has increased dramatically over the period since the *Summary Offences* Act came into force, and in the three months to the end of May 2006, approximately 30 clients presented with public nuisance offences being their primary issue.

The 16 files between 1 April 2004 and 1 October 2005 were used to answer the questions in the issues paper. In the appendix we have included a summary of those files, and have also provided a snapshot of the files in May 2006 to assist the Commission in analysing more recent policing of the provision.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

'Public nuisance' in the context of current social policy

As a starting point for this submission, Caxton notes that there are complex issues surrounding the use of public space in modern Queensland society and this should be borne in mind in this review of the public nuisance provision.

This is an opportunity to focus on providing real solutions to public space problems rather than continuing a one-dimensional "tough on crime" approach of providing greater resources to traditional policing methods that do not produce lasting results.

Further, a more holistic approach to these issues would ease the burden placed on the Queensland Police Service (QPS) by these offences, and would move towards bringing an end to the traditional policing practices that contribute to the marginalisation and imprisonment of Queensland's homeless, young and Indigenous people and those with mental illness.

It is recognised that the QPS requires powers to regulate behaviour in public places. A tool for ensuring public space can be enjoyed by all is clearly fundamental to any civilised society. However, we submit that methods of dealing with these issues that do not involve the criminal justice system are preferable to the current legalistic, black-letter law approach.

A socially responsible approach to public space regulation may appear to be more costly than the traditional policing model, and initially that may be the case. However the costs incurred by adequately funding diversion programs are more than likely to be offset by savings in processing a lower number of public order offenders through the criminal justice system. Resourcing diversion programs therefore represents a medium- to long-term investment which would reduce the overall costs associated with the preservation of appropriate levels of order in public spaces.

Proposed amendments to the provision

If this review supports the continuation of 'public nuisance' as an offence under the *Summary Offences Act*, to ensure that this provision does not unfairly impact upon vulnerable people within our community and to allow the courts flexibility in dealing with this offence, we submit that there should be additional requirements in the provision. These include:

- a defence of 'reasonable excuse';
- the court taking into account:
  - all material circumstances, particularly the defendant's personal circumstances;
  - contemporary community standards;
  - whether the behaviour is sufficiently serious to warrant the intervention of the criminal law; and
  - any other relevant circumstances.

For reasons outlined on page 5 ("Behaviour actually interferes with a member of the public"), it is also submitted that subsection 7(2)(b) should be amended to remove the words "or is likely to interfere".

Imprisonment should not be a sentencing option for public nuisance offences, and the section should be amended accordingly. Further, the fine maximums should reflect the differing nature of offences. For example, the maximum for offensive or disorderly behaviour should be two penalty units whilst violent or threatening behaviour could attract a maximum fine of ten penalty units.

Sentencing

The penalties imposed on individuals for offences under the *Summary Offences Act* are intended to discourage behaviour which impedes the ability of the public to enjoy access to its space. The penalty provisions in the current Act do not affect the prevalence of these offences or increase the ability of the public to

enjoy these spaces more peacefully. This is because these offences are often committed as a result of necessity.

The Indigenous, the mentally ill, the homeless and young people (vulnerable people) are often forced to live their lives in public spaces (Tamara Walsh, 'Who is the public in public space?' (2004) 29(2) *Alternative Law Journal* 81). Caxton endorses Dr Walsh's view that "it is unjust to enact a penalty structure that will not only fail to respond to their needs but actively discriminates against them."

Vulnerable people who are consistently charged with these types of offences are not assisted in any way by the criminal justice penalties currently meted out. Rather a progressive social welfare response is required to ensure that intervention at least has a chance of leading to better circumstances for the "offender" (which would presumably lead to a decrease in offending behaviour) rather than leading to mere exacerbation of their marginalisation.

Caxton further endorses the RIPS view that "imprisonment is far too harsh a response to minor offences...and should be removed as a sentencing option for all public order offences..." Where the circumstances warrant, the more serious offences under other legislation (for example, threatened violence and assault under the *Criminal Code*) provide an adequate legislative and regulatory response. The majority of public order charges we have seen at our Centre do not involve any complaint from members of the public (this will be further elucidated in the question and answer section at the end of this paper) and this is an additional reason that in most situations, it is inappropriate to imprison an offender.

Given the minor nature of many of the offences dealt with, the prescribed fines are excessive – particularly since many offenders will not be able to pay them, resulting in high fine enforcement costs which are borne by SPER (Tamara Walsh, *From Park Bench to Court Bench: Preliminary Report*, 2004). In addition there is no evidence to suggest that these fines act as a deterrent, or will in any way contribute to a reduction in the occurrence of public order offences.

Caxton endorses the further RIPS submission that there is a clear distinction between conduct which is offensive or disorderly, and conduct which is violent and threatening. This distinction should be reflected in the public nuisance provision, by a differentiation in maximum of two penalty units for offensive or disorderly conduct and a maximum of ten penalty units for violent or threatening behaviour.

MATTERS RAISED IN THE ISSUES PAPER

Behaviour actually interferes with a member of the public

A public nuisance offence should not be made out without evidence of actual interference with a member of the public's peaceful passage through or enjoyment of a public place. Mere speculation that a person's behaviour is "likely to" cause such interference should not constitute grounds for an offence. If the behaviour is making people anxious, and may therefore be construed as likely to cause interference, then a move-on direction is the appropriate police response if a traditional police response is required at all. We take this opportunity to comment that the recent amendments to the move-on powers are another example of the ill-advised, overly-legalistic attitude to public space policing in this state.

Complaint from member of public

A complaint-based system should be introduced for public nuisance offences. Police could remain empowered to act as complainants, however, if there is no evidence from a member of the public about the interference to that member's passage through or enjoyment of a public place, such complaints should be dealt with under section 19 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992* (*PSA*). That is, the defendant should be released either absolutely or subject to such conditions as the court sees fit in the circumstances.

In our view a "public order" charge should not be brought unless there is a tangible and real disruption to the "public". The intent of these sections (as indicated in the object of Division 1 of the *Summary Offences Act*) is to give the police powers to control public spaces, to ensure that members of the general public are able to use these spaces without disruption.

Caxton submits that a "public nuisance" may only be considered a "nuisance" if a member of the public is prepared to act as the complainant. If however, this review determines that police should be able to continue to act as complainants, then, as outlined above, section 19 of the *PSA* should be used to ensure that the objects of the *Summary Offences Act* are adequately met without unfair consequences for disadvantaged members of the community.

Overlap with other public space offences

There is certainly an overlap between several of the public space offences.

The most obvious is for clients who are charged with public nuisance in relation to a public urination. This behaviour is adequately dealt with by the wilful exposure provision and does not need the public nuisance provision to be brought into action. It is noted that the maximum penalty for wilful exposure (without aggravation) is two penalty units with no contemplation of imprisonment, whereas the maximum penalty for public nuisance is ten penalty units or one year's imprisonment.

The offence of begging in section 8 of the *Summary Offences Act* also potentially overlaps with the public nuisance offence. Caxton (as a member of RIPS) has opposed and continues to oppose the inclusion of an offence of begging without malice, on the basis that those who beg do so because they feel they have no other choice and doing so in a non-aggressive manner should not be construed as criminal behaviour. The various powers granted to the police under the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000* are more than sufficient to control public space within community expectations with respect to begging.

Any individual or group who have been unfairly or disproportionately targeted by the offence of public nuisance

Homeless people, Indigenous people, young people and people with mental impairment experience the adverse impact of the public nuisance provision to a greater degree than the average person because of their increased use of public space in general, or because their behaviour is different from that of the average person. Caxton therefore submits that these groups are unfairly and disproportionately targeted by the offence of public nuisance, and the legislation should be framed to minimise this.

Impact of a lack of 'reasonable excuse' or other defence

There is no good reason for a lack of a 'reasonable excuse' defence with respect to the public nuisance offence. A defence similar to that in the wilful exposure section would assist in justice being properly administered with respect to behaviour that truly needs checking, as opposed to relatively minor incidents that are of no real consequence in public safety or amenity terms.

The majority of people charged with public nuisance will utilise the services of a duty lawyer. Duty lawyers have extremely high workloads and operate in the often hectic circumstances of the first mention court. Often, in such circumstances, duty lawyers are unable to give sufficient time to establishing in

detail whether or not the elements of public nuisance have been made out in the QP9s. This results in an inordinate number of pleas of guilty to the offence of public nuisance.

The advantage of providing a defence of 'reasonable excuse' is threefold. First, duty lawyers could readily ascertain whether their clients could make out a defence. Second, duty lawyers could advise their clients on the prospects of defending a charge of public nuisance with greater certainty. Third, as a result of increased certainty in relation to defending a public nuisance charge, the circumstances leading to the charge would be more likely to be tested in court, leading to greater transparency with respect to the policing of these offences.

Perception of safety increased? Is this a result of this offence being rigorously enforced or some other reason?

In Caxton's opinion, the perception of public safety has not increased as a result of the rigorous enforcement of this offence. The vast majority of public nuisance charges seen at the Centre are relatively minor incidents, and are not such as to be likely to impact one way or the other on the perception of safety in the community. That is to say, even if the behaviour continued, the majority of the members of the public would not notice. This is evidenced by the fact that seemingly, only one of the complaints we have seen has certainly been brought by a member of the public, and as such, a reduction in this type of behaviour would not change the public perception of safety levels.

Police responses – manner in which police are called to incidents, what response, where are the offences occurring, what level of discretion do police possess, what charges are resulting from behaviour that involves public nuisance?

As indicated above, during the period in question, there was only one instance where a public nuisance charge was certainly brought against a client of the Centre as a result of a complaint from a member of the public. Seemingly, police are on routine duties when they see the behaviour that results in the majority of the charges.

Prior to issuing a notice to appear or arresting a person for a public nuisance offence, a police officer should be required to consider more appropriate alternatives including:

- taking no action;
- issuing a caution;
- using their move on powers;

- contacting welfare agencies for assistance; and
- in matters involving alcohol or other drugs or chroming, taking the vulnerable person to a place of safety.

If a Magistrate considers that a person has been brought before the court in circumstances where it would have been more appropriate to divert the defendant, the Court should dismiss the charge and outline a more appropriate response to the arresting officer.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS IN THE ISSUES PAPER

These responses have been drafted on the basis of the 16 public nuisance files of the Centre between 1 April 2004 and 1 October 2005.

1. What range of behaviour or specific behaviour has resulted in a charge of public nuisance? Also, what language has resulted in a charge of public nuisance?

Each of the following types of behaviour was subject to a charge of public nuisance:

- being pushed by a bouncer;
- asking police and member of the public who had been fighting to 'calm down and be quiet' in a loud voice;
- urination in public;
- refusing to leave area having been ejected from a nightclub;
- 'mouthing off' at people outside a club;
- sexual act with another adult male in a public toilet cubicle;
- walking along a street while slightly intoxicated;
- swearing at a police officer after a reasonably long interaction in response to a traffic offence;
- altercation with librarian;
- walking along street with indigenous male;
- punching back window of police car after having an attack of paranoia, believing people were chasing him and requesting police take him to a safe place and being refused;
- punching a member of the public;
- using language that involved swearing;
- drunken behaviour; and
- altercation with security guard.

a. Is this behaviour of a character that you, your clients or your agency would consider is 'disorderly', 'offensive', 'threatening' or 'violent'? If so, why? If not, why not?

As can be seen in the list above, the majority of cases involve behaviour that is at the 'disorderly' end of the spectrum.

b. Is this language of a character that you, your clients or your agency would consider 'offensive', obscene', indecent', 'abusive' or 'threatening'? If so, why? If not, why not?

The only offence we have record of involved language that falls into the 'obscene' and 'threatening' categories.

Only language that is offensive or threatening should constitute a public nuisance. Swearing alone should not constitute an offence as contemporary standards in relation to such language have changed in recent years.

c. Since 1 April 2004 have you, your clients or your agency recognised any change in the range of behaviour or language that results in a charge of 'public nuisance'?

It is difficult to comment on trends with only a relatively small number of files, but the range of behaviour seems to be consistently at the minor end of the scale, and this seems to have been the case throughout the period since 1 April 2004. In recent times, the number of charges has increased dramatically but no discernible increase or decrease in the level of behaviour has been noted.

2. What proportion of public nuisance charges have been the result of a complaint by a member of the public?

Only one of the 16 files in this analysis in the period 1 April 2004 to 1 October 2005 was certainly brought about by a complaint from a member of the public.

a. Since 1 April 2004 have you, your clients or your agency recognised a change in the proportion of public nuisance charges resulting from complaints by members of the public?

Again, it is difficult to comment on trends with only a relatively small number of files, but there seems to be consistency since 1 April 2004 in that complaints by members of the public are less common than police complaints.

b. In your opinion, or that of your clients or agency, what public interest has been served where there is no complainant to a public nuisance charge?

In Caxton's opinion, no public interest has been served when there is not a member of the public as complainant. The police bringing a charge of public nuisance does not necessarily discourage people from behaving in such a way, because most of the interactions with the police are negative experiences for the individuals involved. This means that they are even less likely to respect the police force if these types of matters are treated this way, so in fact there is a negative impact in terms of respect for police officers and the orders they may rightfully issue. Furthermore, the absence of a member of the public as complainant means that there is no "public relations" aspect to the charges – ie these are not circumstances where the public can see policing in action as a result of their complaint (because they have not complained) and as such, the perception of public safety is not materially enhanced.

The public interest would be greater served by diverting people behaving in a manner that is likely to interfere with enjoyment of or passage through public space away from the criminal justice system, and into a system of assistance that may address their social difficulties rather than compounding them.

3. Have vulnerable groups in society been disproportionately charged or otherwise disproportionately affected by public nuisance charges? If so, in what way have groups been disproportionately charged or individuals disadvantaged?

Caxton does not see many Indigenous or homeless clients, as there are specific community legal services targeting those groups of people. In terms of age, there seems to be a wide spread of ages amongst the 16 files in this analysis, but it is noteworthy that four of the 16 files were between the ages of 17 and 25. Two of the 16 files indicated some sort of mental health issue or other mental impairment.

It is difficult to comment empirically on the disproportionate effect on disadvantaged people, but as indicated earlier in this submission, Caxton submits that there is a disproportionate effect and fully endorses the RIPS submission to the *Summary Offences Bill* consultation in this regard.

a. What impact has the public nuisance provision had on people identified, or identifying, as young, Indigenous, homeless and/or suffering from a mental illness?

See answer 3.

b. What impact has the public nuisance provision had on other people in the community?

Can't comment with current data. It is noteworthy however, that the majority of the clients of the Centre had not been involved with the criminal justice system prior to these incidents occurring.

4. Does the Summary Offences Act provide adequate defences for a person charged with an offence of public nuisance? If so, why? If not, why not?

There is no defence available to a charge of public nuisance in the *Summary Offences Act*. The only defences in the Act are in sections 9 (wilful exposure), 15 (possession of implement) and 17 (graffiti instrument).

There should be a defence of 'reasonable excuse' as in the wilful exposure provision, to ensure that punishment for behaviour that interferes with public enjoyment or passage through public space balances community rights and expectations of public order with individual rights and an individual's need to respond to their immediate circumstances.

a. Since 1 April 2004 have you, your clients or your agency recognised a change in the range of available defences to a charge of 'public nuisance'?

As has been the case since 1 April 2004, there are no defences available now to a charge of public nuisance.

5. What impact, if any, has the public nuisance provision had upon the safety or community use of public spaces?

As indicated above, according to the 16 files in this analysis, only one was certainly instigated by a complaint from a member of the public. This indicates that it is generally not community members, but police, who are interested in changing the behaviour that has been exhibited by these clients. By corollary, community use of public spaces has not been impacted in any positive way by this provision.

Conversely, disadvantaged members of the community who use public space as their only space may feel inhibited with respect to their use of that space. This may in fact lead to a decrease in safety for those people, because they will be moving further away from the common gathering places and into more physically isolated areas where they are more likely to become victims of crime themselves.

6. Does the current public nuisance offence overlap with other existing offences? If so, what other offences and in what way?

As indicated above, begging and wilful exposure are two obvious examples where clients are charged with public nuisance when one of these other offences could be more appropriate.

a. For example, what is the relationship between public nuisance arising (s. 6) from urination in public and wilful exposure (s. 9) arising from the same conduct? What is the relationship between public nuisance (s. 6) arising from a person seeking money from another person in a manner that causes that person to be intimidated or concerned, and begging (s. 8) arising from the same conduct?

Both cases of public nuisance involving urination that we have seen at the Centre in the relevant period could have resulted in a charge of wilful exposure rather than one of public nuisance.

None of our case examples during the period were concerned with begging.

b. If there is an overlap between public nuisance and other offences, is this problematic? If so, in what way? If not, why not?

By having an overlap where one offence has a defence and one does not (as in the wilful exposure overlap), there may be selective charging by the police so that a conviction is more likely to be secured. This is not a good enough reason for preferring one offence over the other. In addition, the public nuisance offence has a greater maximum penalty, so it seems unfair to the "offender" that potentially the police could prefer the public nuisance charge in order to be able to request a harsher penalty (for public nuisance) for behaviour that is essentially only an infringement of the lesser wilful exposure provision.

7. Has a charge of public nuisance ever been used as an alternative to another offence?
If so, what was the alternative charge?

As indicated above, public nuisance was charged on two occasions where wilful exposure could have been charged instead.

a. In your experience, was a charge of public nuisance used as a less severe or more severe charge?

Public nuisance was used as a more severe charge. Wilful exposure is seemingly a less serious charge as it carries a maximum penalty of only two penalty units, cf ten penalty units for public nuisance.

8. Have charges of public nuisance typically been accompanied by other charges? If so, what charges and in what circumstances?

Contravene direction (section 445 *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act*), obstruct police (section 444 *PPRA*) and assault police (section 444 *PPRA*) are the three most commonly occurring ancillary charges. Of the 16 files in this analysis, six had at least one of those extra offences. Of the six, on five occasions clients reported that they had been enquiring as to why they were being dealt with, or questioning the way they were being dealt with (for example, asking why they were being arrested or why they were being fingerprinted). This suggests that additional charges are being used as a punitive or retaliatory mechanism against anyone who is less than a model "offender".

a. Are charges that accompanied public nuisance charges the result of behaviour that occurred before or after police intervention in a situation?

Of the six files that had at least one extra offence, the extra offence occurred after the police intervention in relation to the public nuisance charge in all six files.

b. In your experience, was there a change in charges accompanying public nuisance charges after 1 April 2004?

Can't comment with current data.

9. Where have most charged incidents of public nuisance taken place? (e.g. mall, school, road, outside licensed premises, park)

Of the 14 files where the place of the offence is known, ten occurred outside licensed premises.

a. Have public nuisance charges taken place in areas that were not public spaces? If so, where did they take place?

This is not obvious from the files at the centre in the relevant period, though one file in May 2006 was certainly pertaining to behaviour in a non-public space (someone's backyard).

b. Has there been an increase in public nuisance charges in any particular location since 1 April 2004?

Can't comment with current data.

10. Do police exercise their discretion appropriately with respect to public nuisance incidents? If so, why? If not, why not?

In Caxton's opinion, there does not seem to be an appropriate exercise of discretion. It would seem more appropriate to give a caution or a move-on direction rather than charging with public nuisance in many cases, because the balance of public safety with public use of space does not require much of this behaviour to be criminalised.

11. What has been the most common police response to a public nuisance incident? (e.g. arrest, issue a notice to appear, caution)

Of the eight files where it is clear that arrest occurred or a notice to appear was given, arrest occurred on six occasions. There were not any files where a caution was given.

a. In your experience, have there been common factors dictating the nature of the police response? (e.g. location of offence, social identity of the offender)

There were varied circumstances, but as outlined above, most were outside licensed premises.

14 of the 16 files involved males.

b. Has there been any perceived change in police response since 1 April 2004?

Can't comment with current data.

Client No	Sex	Income Level	Mental Impairment/Mental Health issue	Alcohol or Drugs Involved	Age Group	Complainant	Charged with Other Offences	Police Action Taken
1	M	Low, Pension/ Benefit	No	Yes - Alcohol	50+	Unknown	Yes - Obstruct and Assault Police	Unsure
2	M	Low, Earned	No	Unknown	17 to 25	Unknown	No	Unsure
3	M	Low, Pension/ Benefit	Yes, Acquired Brain Injury	Yes - Alcohol	26 to 35	Police	No	Unsure
4	M	Low, Earned	No	Yes - Alcohol	17 to 25	Police	No	Notice to Appear
5	M	Low, Earned	No	Unknown	26 to 35	Unknown	Yes - Obstruct and Assault Police	Arrest
7	M	Low, Pension/ Benefit	Yes, requesting Psychological Report	No	50+	Unknown	No	Notice to Appear
8	M	Low, earned	No	Yes - Alcohol	36 to 49	Police	Yes - Contravene Requirement and Obstruct Police	Arrest
9	F	Medium, earned	No	No	17 to 25	Police	No	Arrest

10	M	Low, Pension/ Benefit	No	No	36 to 49	Member of public	No	Unknown
11	F	Low, Earned	No	No	36 to 49	Police	Yes - Contravene Requirement and Obstruct Police	Arrest
12	M	Medium, Earned	Yes, requesting Psychological Report	Yes, Ecstasy/Speed	26 to 35	Police	Yes - Obstruct and Assault Police	Arrest
13	M	Low, Earned	No	Yes, Alcohol	17 to 25	Unknown	No	Unknown
14	M	Medium, Earned	No	Yes, Alcohol	26 to 35	Police	Yes - Obstruct Police	Arrest
15	M	Low, Pension/ benefit	No	Yes, Alcohol	36 to 49	Police	No	Unknown
16	M	Medium, Earned	No	Unknown	36 to 49	Police	No	Unknown

Appendix 2

Public nuisance cases – clients of the Centre in May 2006

1. Facts unknown - intends to plead guilty and request no conviction recorded – information re process given.

2. Stopped for apparently no reason (Sat pm), refused to give name and address – arrested, force used, placed in cell until next morning. Told little about extra contravene charge.

3. 2 clients pushed bottles off wall into private property. Arrested, pushed to ground. Suspected of damaging public property. Taken into custody and held overnight in cell. 1 client hysterical - police behaviour reported as aggressive - released in morning with notice to appear.

4. Asked police about arrest of friend – sworn at by police and told "you'll be arrested", asked again and was arrested on additional obstruct police charge.

5. Broke up fight in club - no punches thrown by client - charged with public nuisance, assault police and obstruct police.

6. In nightclub, pushed off chair, down steps and out door by bouncer. Confronted bouncer who called police. Arrested and charged with public nuisance.

7. No facts on file but client stated that she has bruises and the arrest was not of standard procedure.

8. No facts taken. Client advised on guilty plea.

9. Possess cannabis and public nuisance – no facts taken but intends to plead guilty