

PRISONERS REVIEW BOARD — EARLY PAROLE — LUKE NOORMETS

632. Ms L. METTAM to the Attorney General:

I refer to the opposition's repeated calls for an urgent government review of decision-making processes by the Prisoners Review Board following the PRB's decision to ignore Luke Noormets' violent history and past convictions when approving his early release.

- (1) Given the news that Danny Hodgson's one-punch attacker had been released early and has since assaulted a woman, what is the government going to do to stop repeat offenders from being released early?
- (2) Why is the Cook Labor government putting the freedom of violent offenders ahead of community safety?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

- (1)–(2) The member for Vasse takes my breath away, fair dinkum. It was this government—sorry, it was Premier McGowan's government, of which the present Premier was Deputy Premier—that introduced the serious high-risk offenders' legislation to keep dangerous offenders in prison beyond their sentence. It was criticised at the time by some members of the opposition. We have taken away the liberty of people who are dangerous who have already served their sentence. That is what we are doing.

I turn to the case of Noormets, which the member raised. I have sought information on this. Members will see and no doubt have noted that on the Prisoners Review Board website, the board gives reasons for its decisions. The reasons given for the Noormets matter and for him being suitable for parole was that there was no prior history of violence. I am a little at a loss to understand that. He had not been convicted of an assault prior to the dreadful incident resulting in the murder, the loss of life. However, on 12 April 2011, he went to his former partner's home and made a menace of himself at the front door. He was not granted access. He was making threats about taking his own life or damaging himself. The police were called because the occupiers would not let him in and a police order was issued for him to stay away from the premises for 48 hours to give the lady and the occupants the opportunity of getting a violence restraining order. But before they had that opportunity, he returned later that night, in the early hours of the morning. He hid in a bush, contrary to the police order. When the couple went inside, he kicked the door in, smashed a stained-glass window so that he could put his hand through it and unlock the door and he went inside and issued threats against the new boyfriend, who the family had wisely secreted in a linen cupboard. This was a violent occurrence. However, he was charged with trespass, wilful damage of the doors and breaching the police order. They were the three convictions. Those three convictions on his record were before the Prisoners Review Board. I regard that there has been insufficient detail placed before the Prisoners Review Board. It had no knowledge of what was on the integrated court management system. I am making the inquiries into whether we need to have better information, going forward. I regard any breach of a police order or a family violence restraining order as a circumstance that the Prisoners Review Board should give great weight to because it is a predictor of further violence.

We have done a lot. We have done more than the conservative government did in eight years to keep violent people off the street. I will leave it there and wait for the member's supplementary question.