## IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA MELBOURNE REGISTRY

No. M19 / 2015

### **BETWEEN:**

### TANIA ISBESTER Appellant

10

# and

### KNOX CITY COUNCIL Respondent

### **APPELLANT'S CHRONOLOGY**

#### Part I:

I certify that this chronology is in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

20

30

40

50

Attn: Daniel Beecher

Date	Event 5	
4 August 2012	The Appellant's dogs "Izzy" and "Jock" were involved in an attack on another dog and on a person.	
29 May 2013	The Appellant's dogs "Jock" and "Bub" were involved in an attack on another dog.	
9 June 2013	The Appellant's dogs "Izzy" and "Jock" were involved in a series of attacks on other dogs, the latter attack also involving a person. "Jock" was destroyed at the Appellant's request.	
20 June 2013	The Appellant was charged with 23 offences under the <i>Dome</i> Animals Act 1994 (Vic) in relation to the incidents on 4 Augus 2012 and 29 May 2013. Ms Debbie Williams, an authorised o of the Respondent, was the informant on the charge sheet.	
24 June 2013	The Appellant was charged with 6 offences under the <i>Domestic</i> Animals Act 1994 (Vic) in relation to the incident on 4 August 2012 including, relevantly, charge 4 which provided that Izzy had	
-	attacked or bitten a person and caused serious injury to that person (being a contravention of section 29(4) of the Act).Ms Kirsten Hughes was the informant on the charge sheet.	
26 July 2013	Ms Hughes wrote to Susan Fotopolous, a Housing Services Officer at theDepartment of Human Services, Office of Housing, and asked Ms Fotopolous to advise "DHS's position in relation to the two dogs owned by Tania Isbester and allegedly involved in two attacks in June 2013?" She also asked whether DHS would oppose the dogs returning to Ms Isbester's home.	
30 July 2013	Ms Fotopolous replied to Ms Hughes' email dated 26 July 2013, and stated that "DHS will not be supporting the two dogs returnin to the property GH COURT OF AUSTRALIA	
August 2013	The Appellant's solicitor negotiated a plea deal with the Council's Solicitors in which she agreed to plead guilty to 20 charges in relation to the incidents on 4 August 2012, 29 May 2013 and 9 June 2013.	

Ref: FDB/089903/14D

	28 August 2013	By an email to the solicitors for the Respondent, Mr Melke asked what the Council intended about the fate of the two remaining
		dogs, given that the dog Jock had already been euthanised.
	29 August 2013	Ms Hughes wrote to the Respondent's solicitor and stated that
		"the housing commission have indicated the dog [Bub] can not
		be housed at [the Appellant's residence]." She then said, "Council
		would be having a panel hearing in relation to the fate of Izzy and
10		Isbester would be notified of this shortly after the Court case".
	29 August 2013	The Respondent's solicitors sent an email to Mr Melke which said,
		"Council will not be seeking an order from the court in relation to
10		the destruction of the dogs."
	12 September 2013	The Appellant was convicted of the 20 charges to which she
		pleaded guilty and placed on a community corrections order for a
		period of 12 months. Relevantly, the Appellant pleaded guilty to
		charge 4, being a contravention of s 29(4) the <i>Domestic Animals</i>
		Act 1994 (Vic). This contravention was based on the dog "Izzy"
		having bitten a person causing a "serious injury", namely a 1.5cm
		laceration on the person's middle finger. The injury occurred when
	13 September 2013	the person tried to pull "Izzy" of her daughter's dog. Ms Hughes wrote to the Appellant to inform her that the Council
		intended to consider whether to exercise the power in s 84P of the
20		Act to have Izzy destroyed and invited the plaintiff to a 'panel
		hearing' on 30 September 2013.
	30 September 2013	The panel hearing was held. The panel was constituted by Mr
		Angelo Kourambas, Ms Hughes and a Mr Dickson. Ms Hughes
		made both oral and written submissions to the panel. The victim
		of the 4 August 2012 incident made representations to the panel,
		during which time the Appellant (and her family and friends) were
		asked to leave the room. Ms Hughes read out part of her notes
		from the Magistrates' Court hearing on 13 September 2013. After
		the panel hearing and following a discussion with other members
30	2 1 -	of the panel, Mr Kourambas decided that "Izzy" should be
	0-1-1	destroyed.
	October 2013	Ms Hughes drafted the decision and the reasons for it.
	15 October 2013	The Appellant was notified by letter of the decision and reasons.

Dated 10/03/2015

Name: Francis Daniel Beecher Phoenix Legal Solutions Telephone: (03) 9480 0736 Facsimile: (03) 8888 9933 Email: daniel@phoenixlegalsolutions.com.au

50

40

ş

Ĵ,