# IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA PERTH REGISTRY

No. P48 of 2019

#### BETWEEN:

## DYLAN TERRANCE WAYNE ANTHONY

Appellant

and

FILED

1 8 DEC 2019

THE REGISTRY PERTH

THE STATE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Respondent

### APPELLANT'S REPLY

## Part I:

10

1. These submissions are in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

## 20 Part II:

- 2. The State contends that Beech JA's construction detracts from the primacy of the 'acts or omissions' insofar as the definition of what is called an offence is concerned.
- 3. To the contrary, such a construction highlights that there are two essential constituents of 'an offence'. Firstly, the acts or omissions described in the various offence creating provisions in the Code. Second, that the relevant acts or omissions must also render the person who did the acts or made the omissions 'liable to punishment'. Section 2 of the *Criminal Code* (WA) (the Code) places no primacy in one essential constituent of 'an offence' over the other.

30

Legal Aid Western Australia 32 St Georges Terrace Perth W.A. 6000 Telephone: (08) 9261 6295 Fax: (08) 9261 6554

Email: CriminalAppealsTeam@legalaid.wa.gov.au

Reference: Andrew Robson

R v Barlow [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1 does not support a construction 4. that requires the principal's act or omission to be considered divorced from the

principal's criminal responsibility.

5. In the context of section 8 of the Code, the plurality in R v Barlow [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1 at 10 explained that liability for the principal offender's act or omission only arises for the secondary offender as (1) that act or omission renders

the principal liable to punishment and (2) only to the extent that that act or omission was a probable consequence of prosecuting a common unlawful purpose.

6. In any event, no issue as to the criminal responsibility of the principal offender arose for consideration in R v Barlow [1997] HCA 19; (1997) 188 CLR 1.

7. Further, the State contends that Beech JA's construction renders superfluous

section 7(a) of the Code.

8. To the contrary, section 7(a) of the Code has work to do where two offenders act in

concert to collectively do the acts or make the omissions which constitute the

offence.

10

In such a circumstance, section 7(a) of the Code provides that each of the two 9.

offenders acting in concert would only be deemed to be guilty of the offence where

the acts or omissions done collectively constitute the offence, and when an offence

has been committed.

Section 7(a) of the Code would therefore be as essential within Beech JA's 20 10.

construction as sections 7(b), (c) and (d) and 8 of the Code.

Dated:

18 December 2019

Name: Sam Vandongen SC

Telephone: (08) 9220 0444

Facsimile: (08) 9325 9894

Email: svandongen@francisburt.com.au