Police Powers

Power of Arrest

Whether X was lawfully arrested?

LEPRA establishes two preconditions that must be satisfied for a person to be arrested without a warrant ($\frac{99(1)}{1}$).

(1): Whether the police officer had reasonable suspicion 'that the person is committing or has committed an offence' ($\frac{99(1)(a)}{2}$)?

- Reasonable suspicion must have 'some factual basis' and requires 'less than a reasonable belief but more than a possibility' (Rondo). This is a prospective test that considers the officer's subjective knowledge (Rondo).
- Here,...

Potential extras if relevant:

- 'some factual basis' (Rondo)
- 'may be based on hearsay material or materials which may be inadmissible in evidence'
- Rondo:
- trial judge: appellant's reaching across to the passenger's side of the Supra + appearing to place something in the glovebox (after the car was stopped) might reasonably raise a suspicion
 - held: this was borderline case but did not oppose trial judge's finding

(2): Whether the arrest was 'reasonably necessary for any one or more of the following reasons' (s 99(1)(b))?

- (i) 'to stop the person committing or repeating the offence or committing another offence'
- (ii) 'to stop the person fleeing from a police officer or from the location of the offence'
- (iii) 'to enable inquiries to be made to establish the person's identity if it cannot be readily established or if the police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that identity information provided is false'
- (iv) 'to ensure that the person appears before a court in relation to the offence'
- (v) 'to **obtain property in the possession** of the person that is connected with the offence'
- (vi) 'to preserve evidence of the offence or prevent the fabrication of evidence'
- (vii) 'to **prevent the harassment of, or interference with**, any person who may give evidence in relation to the offence'
- (viii) 'to protect the safety or welfare of any person (including the person arrested)'
- (ix) 'because of the nature and seriousness of the offence'
- arrest must be conducted for a proper purpose (McClean)
- arrest for the purpose of investigation or interrogation is unlawful Here, the arrest could be considered reasonably necessary' due to...

Arrest must be used a last resort (Carr).

- circumstances as to whether arrest was used as last resort (Carr):
 - Is it a trivial offence?
 - in Carr- arrest was for offensive language

- Do the police know who + where the person lives?
- Would a court attendance notice be sufficient?

If unlawfully arrested

Since the arrest was unlawful, must now consider: Whether the evidence should be admitted (s 138)?

- When evidence is obtained 'improperly', as is the case here, the court must take into account the factors set out in s 138(3) to determine whether 'the desirability of admitting the evidence outweighs the undesirability' (s 138(1)).
- Here,...
 - the court will take into account (s 138(3)):
 - (a) probative value of the evidence
 - (b) importance of the evidence in the proceeding
 - (c) **nature of the relevant offence**, cause of action or defence and the nature of the subject-matter of the proceeding
 - (d) **gravity** of the impropriety or contravention
 - (e) whether the impropriety or contravention was deliberate or reckless
 - (f) whether the impropriety or contravention was **contrary to or inconsistent with** a right of a person recognised by the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**
 - (g) whether any other proceeding (whether or not in a court) has been or is likely to be taken in relation to the impropriety or contravention
 - (h) difficulty (if any) of obtaining the evidence without impropriety or contravention of an Australian law

Search Powers

Whether the search was lawful (LEPRA s 21)?

A search will be legal if the police officer has reasonable suspicion that any of the circumstances set out in s 21 of LEPRA exist.

- Reasonable suspicion must have 'some factual basis' and requires 'less than a reasonable belief but more than a possibility' (Rondo). This is a prospective test that considers the officer's subjective knowledge (Rondo).
- Here....
 - (a) 'person has in his or her possession or under his or her control anything stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained'
 - (b) 'person has in his or her possession or under his or her control anything used or intended to be used in or in connection with the commission of a relevant offence'
 - (c) 'person has in his or her possession or under his or her control in a public place a dangerous article that is being or was used in or in connection with the commission of a relevant offence'
 - (d) 'person has in his or her possession or under his or her control, a prohibited plant or drug'
- A PO can seize + detain (s 21(2)):
- any 'prohibited drug or plant'
- anything stolen or unlawfully obtained

- evidence for the commission of an offence
- any danger article
- A PO may require the person to 'open his or her mouth' or move 'his or her hair' if there is reasonable suspicion (s 21A)

Drug dogs

Whether or not the dog's conduct constituted a search?

• Darby:

- search: if the dog doesn't know where the drugs are or if the officer is directing the dog to search people
- not a search: if the dog knows where the drugs are (e.g if the dog puts its nose exactly where the drugs are- merely showing the police officer specifically where the drugs are)

• Harris:

- although dogs may incidentally but lawfully touch people, the police must take all reasonable precautions to avoid sniffer dogs making contract with anybody
 - dog touching can establish a battery
- A police officer must 'take all reasonable precautions to prevent the dog touching a person' (s
 150(1)) + the officer must feel the dog under control (s 150(2))

Whether the sniffer dogs search was legal?

- sniffers dogs can be used 'to carry out drug detection' to the following persons seeking to enter or leave (s 148):
- Premises for the consumption of liquor
- Public place (sport, concert, artistic performance, party, parade, entertainment)
- Public passenger vehicles
- Tattoo Parlours
- Any public place in the Kings Cross precinct
- **general:** officer is entitled to use a dog if s/he 'is authorised to search a person for the purpose of detecting a drug offence' (s 146(1))
- with a warrant: 'may use a dog to carry out general drug detection if authorised to do so by a warrant' (s 149(1))

Consent

- if persons gives consent- do not have to comply with LEPRA requirements (s 34)
- however, before consent is given the officer must prove that they are an officer, state their name
 + place of duty
- consent needs to be real + have substantial freedom + liberty (S and J)