

NOTICE OF FILING AND HEARING

Filing and Hearing Details

Document Lodged:	Interlocutory Application (Human Rights Div 2.4 Exemption) - Form 35 - Rule 17.01(1)(a)
Court of Filing:	FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA (FCA)
Date of Lodgment:	17/10/2024 3:33:21 PM AEDT
Date Accepted for Filing:	22/10/2024 8:06:07 AM AEDT
File Number:	VID944/2023
File Title:	MADISON MAY BURNS v STATE OF QUEENSLAND
Registry:	VICTORIA REGISTRY - FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA
Reason for Listing:	To Be Advised
Time and date for hearing:	To Be Advised
Place:	To Be Advised



Sia Lagos

Registrar

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the first page of the document which has been accepted for electronic filing. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties.

The date of the filing of the document is determined pursuant to the Court's Rules.



Interlocutory application

No. VID944 of 2023

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: Victoria
Division:

Madison May Burns

Applicant

State of Queensland

Respondent

To the Respondent

The Applicant applies for the interlocutory orders set out in this application.

The Court will hear this application, or make orders for the conduct of the proceeding, at the time and place stated below. If you or your lawyer do not attend, then the Court may make orders in your absence.

Time and date for hearing:

Place:

The Court ordered that the time for serving this application be abridged to

Date:

Signed by an officer acting with the authority
of the District Registrar

Filed on behalf of (name & role of party) **MADISON MAY BURNS (APPLICANT)**

Prepared by (name of person/lawyer) **Jerry Tucker, Solicitor**

Law firm (if applicable) **Bottoms English Lawyers**

Tel **(07) 4051 5388** Fax **(07) 4051 5206**

Email **bottomslaw@belaw.com.au**

Address for service **18 Shields Street, Cairns City QLD 4870**
(include state and postcode)



Interlocutory orders sought

1. The Respondent's Application dated 4 April 2024 to strike out the Applicant's Statement of Claim be dismissed without adjudication on the merits.
2. The Applicant have leave to file an Amended Originating Application in the form of Annexure A to this Application.
3. The Applicant have leave to file an Amended Statement of Claim in the form of Annexure B to this Application.
4. By 16 December 2024, the Respondent make discovery pursuant to Rule 20.15 of the *Federal Court Rules 2011* by filing and serving verified lists of documents in its possession, custody or power in the following categories:
 - a. Madison Burns' child safety documents, whether electronic or hard copy, created or referred to between 27 August 2002 and 27 August 2020 in the possession, custody, or power of the Respondent, including all Case Notes, without redaction or masking, inclusive of referrals to support services;
 - b. Documents, whether electronic or hard copy, created or referred to between 27 August 2002 and 27 August 2020 in the possession, custody, or power of the Respondent, without redaction or masking, relating to or evidencing any steps taken by the Respondent to enable or assist Madison Burns learning about her First Nations family, history, culture, country, and language;
 - c. Guidelines operative during the Child Claim Period for ascertaining suitable carers for children subject to protection orders under the Child Protection Act 1999 (Qld) (**protected children**);
 - d. Checklists or other documents for the use of case workers operative during the Child Claim Period to ascertain suitable carers for protected children; and
 - e. Instructions to Child Safety Officers as to placement of protected children.

Service on the Respondent

It is intended to serve this application on the Respondent.

Date: 17 October 2024



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jerry Tucker", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Signed by Jerry Tucker
Lawyer for the Applicant



Annexure 'A' - Amended Originating Application

Form 19
Rule 9.32



**Amended Originating application starting a representative proceeding under Part IVA of
the Federal Court of Australia Act 1976**

No. VID944 of 2023

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: Victoria
Division:

Madison May Burns

Applicant

State of Queensland

Respondent

To the Respondent

The Applicant applies for the relief set out in this application.

The Court will hear this application, or make orders for the conduct of the proceeding, at the time and place stated below. If you or your lawyer do not attend, then the Court may make orders in your absence.

You must file a notice of address for service (Form 10) in the Registry before attending Court or taking any other steps in the proceeding.

Time and date for hearing:

Place:

Date:

.....
Signed by an officer acting with the authority
of the District Registrar

Filed on behalf of (name & role of party) **MADISON MAY BURNS (APPLICANT)**

Prepared by (name of person/lawyer) **Jerry Tucker, Solicitor**

Law firm (if applicable) **Bottoms English Lawyers**

Tel **(07) 4051 5388** Fax **(07) 4051 5206**

Email **bottomslaw@belaw.com.au**

Address for service **18 Shields Street, Cairns City QLD 4870**
(include state and postcode)

[Form approved 01/08/2011]



Details of claim

On the grounds stated in the accompanying Statement of Claim, the Applicant claims:

1. An order that the Respondent sets up a process of consultation with the Applicant and each Group Member person affected by its conduct as set out in the Statement of Claim, directed to facilitating the resumption, restoration or formation of a family relationship between the Applicant and each Group Member who were removed from their parent or parents by the Respondent, wherever possible all such consultations to be undertaken in a trauma-informed and culturally safe way.
2. An order that it undertake to train all staff dealing with child protection matters concerning First Nations families in trauma-informed and culturally safe interviewing and decision-making.
3. An order that it provide the resources reasonably necessary to the Applicant and each Group Member seeking the restoration, resumption or formation of a family relationship with their respective children it has removed.
4. An order that Respondent publish formal apology in all First Nations languages commonly in use in Queensland for its previous child removal practices.
5. An order that that the Respondent must exercise its powers and functions under the *Child Protection Act 1999* (Qld) in accordance with law and with the child placement principles within that Act.
6. Compensation.

Definitions

Terms defined in the Statement of Claim in these proceedings have the same meaning in this document.

Questions common to claims of Group Members

The questions of law or fact common to the claims of the Group Members are:

1. Was the Applicant and each Group Member removed from their family by the Respondent wholly or partly because of their race?
2. Was the placement of the Applicant and each Group Member wholly or partly because of their race?



3. Did the Respondent consider or adequately consider:
 - a. Kinship care; or alternatively
 - b. Care with indigenous people of the same or similar language groupswhen determining where to place the Applicant and the Group Members after removal?
4. Did the Respondent consider or adequately consider one or more of the Applicant's and the group members':
 - a. Connection to their traditional or cultural country;
 - b. Connection to their traditional culture;
 - c. Connection to their traditional or cultural language;when determining where to place the Applicant and the Group Members after removal?
5. Did the Respondent facilitate or adequately facilitate one or more of the Applicant's and the Group Members':
 - a. Connection to their traditional or cultural country;
 - b. Connection to their traditional culture;
 - c. Connection to their traditional or cultural language;after removal?
6. Did the Respondent investigate or adequately investigate whether the Applicant and each of the group members had a parent within the meaning of section 11 of the Act?
7. Were the Applicant and the group members less able than non-indigenous children who had been removed and placed by the Respondent to understand the
 - a. Bureaucracy;
 - b. Requirements;
 - c. Powers; and
 - d. Means of review of the decisions ofthe Respondent, by reason of:
 - e. culture,
 - f. language,
 - g. lower literacy, or
 - h. more deprived socioeconomic circumstancesthan non-indigenous children removed from their parents by the Respondent?



Representative action

The Applicant brings this application as a representative party under Part IVA of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976*.

The Applicant brings this application pursuant to ss 46 PO and 46 PB of the *Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986 (AHRC Act)* on her own behalf and as a representative on behalf of:

- (a) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons;
- (b) who were aged 14 years or older on 13 November 2023; and
- (c) who were removed by the Respondent from their families between 5 March 1992 and 13 November 2023; and
- (d) allege that following their removal their connection with their family, kinship network, community, culture, country, traditions and/or language, was not adequately facilitated by the Respondent.

~~all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, aged at least 14 years at the date of issue of these proceedings, who have been subject to the same similar or related discrimination as the Applicant set out in the Statement of Claim at any time between 5 March 1992 and the date of issue of these proceedings (the **Children's Claim Period**).~~

Accompanying documents

1. Reasons for the decision to terminate the amended representative complaint given by the Delegate of the President of the Australian Human Rights Commission dated 14 September 2023.
2. A copy of the representative complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission dated 22 December 2022.
3. A copy of the amended representative complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission dated 31 May 2023.
4. Notice of termination of the complaint given by the Delegate of the President of the Australian Human Rights Commission dated 14 September 2023.

Applicant's address

The Applicant's address for service is: Bottoms English Lawyers

Place: 18 Shields Street, Cairns City QLD 4870

Email: jerrytucker@belaw.com.au

**Service on the Respondent**

It is intended to serve this originating application on the Respondent.

Date: 12 November 2023

Signed by Jerry Mae Tucker
Lawyer for the Applicant



Annexure 'B' - Amended Statement of Claim



AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

No. VID944 of 2023

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: Victoria
Division:

Madison May Burns

Applicant

State of Queensland

Respondent

Definitions

~~“Child Removal Intervention” means removal of a child from the care of his or her parents pursuant to the *Child Protection Act 1999 (Qld)* (as amended) (the Act)~~

“Act” means the Child Protection Act 1999 (Qld) (as amended).

“Children’s Claim Period” means 30 March 1999 to the date of issue of these proceedings.

“Family Healing” means any of:

- a) restoration;
- b) resumption; or
- c) formation

of a family relationship.

“Indigenous” or “First Nations” means Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander, as appropriate in context.

“race” includes colour, descent, nationality or ethnic origin.

~~“parent” in relation to a Child Removal Intervention purportedly pursuant to the Act has the meaning given to it by s 11 of the Act.~~

“First Nations Parent” in relation to an Aboriginal child means a person who under Aboriginal tradition is regarded as a parent of the relevant child within the meaning of s 11(3) of the Act or

Filed on behalf of (name & role of party)

MADISON MAY BURNS (APPLICANT)

Prepared by (name of person/lawyer)

Jerry Tucker, Solicitor

Law firm (if applicable)

Bottoms English Lawyers

Tel (07) 4051 5388

Fax

(07) 4051 5206

Email bottomsllaw@belaw.com.au

Address for service

18 Shields Street, Cairns City QLD 4870

(include state and postcode)



in relation to Torres Strait Islander children, a person who, under Island custom, is regarded as a parent of the relevant child within the meaning of s 11(4) of the Act.

Representative proceeding

1. The Applicant brings this proceeding on her own behalf and as a representative party pursuant to Part IVA of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (FCA Act).
2. The Applicant brings this application pursuant to ss 46 PO and 46 PB of the *Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986* (AHRC Act) on her own behalf, and as a representative on behalf of:
 - (a) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons ~~children~~;
 - (b) who were aged 14 years or older on 13 November 2023; and
 - (c) who were removed by the Respondent from their families between 5 March 1992 and 13 November 2023; and
 - (d) allege that following their removal their connection with their family, kinship network, community, culture, country, traditions and/or language, was not adequately facilitated by the Respondent.
 - ~~(e) who have been subject to discrimination by the State of Queensland;~~

~~which was the same, similar, or related to the discrimination suffered by the Applicant at any time during the Children's Claim Period.~~
3. As at the date of the commencement of this proceeding, seven or more Group Members have claims against the Respondent within the meaning of s 33C of the FCA Act.

Legislation

4. The Act has provided power for the Respondent to remove children from the custody of their parents since 30 March 1999.
5. The *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth) (the **RDA**) has been in force for the entirety of the Children's Claim Period and prohibits unlawful discrimination on the basis of race.

The Applicant

6. The Applicant is a First Nations woman of Aboriginal descent ~~on her father's side.~~
6. ~~The Applicant's maternal family is not First Nations.~~



7. The Applicant was born on 27 August 2002.
8. The Applicant was removed from her maternal family by being taken into the custody of the Respondent by the Chief Executive, pursuant to the Act shortly after she was born.
9. Following the Applicant's removal, a Child Protection Order was made pursuant to s 59 of the Act.
10. The Applicant was initially placed with a foster family whose race she is not aware of.

Particulars

Particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

11. From the time of her removal, at various times the Applicant remained in the custody, under the guardianship, or subject to some other form of supervision of the Chief Executive within the meaning of the Act until she was aged 18 years.
12. During her time in the custody of the Respondent, it refused to tell the Applicant who her paternal family was or what her traditional Language, Country and Culture were.

Particulars

The Applicant is presently unable to provide particulars of her requests and the Respondent's failures. Particulars may be provided after discovery and evidence.

13. During her time in the custody of the Respondent the Applicant was separated from her siblings and was placed from time to time with non Indigenous carers and in residential group homes.

Particulars

During her period in the custody of the Chief Executive, the Applicant was placed in numerous different foster families, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and in residential group homes. The Applicant can remember being placed with:

- a) a foster family of unknown race;
- b) her maternal grandmother's sister;
- c) her aunt;
- d) another foster family;
- e) her maternal grandmother;
- f) her aunt Erin;
- g) Indigenous foster carers;



- h) residential group homes;
- i) foster parents called Stephanie and Brian;
- j) an abusive boyfriend when the Respondent said it had no capacity with foster families or residential group homes; and
- k) alone in various motels.

Further particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

14. During her time in the custody of the Respondent, the Applicant received a sporadic and disruptive schooling.

Particulars

- a) Attended at least five different schools; and
- b) Was not able or supported to attend school past grade 9.

Further particulars may be provided after discovery and evidence.

- ~~15. The matters set out in paragraph 8 to 14 above were wholly or partly because of or a function of the Applicant's race.~~
15. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 10 to 14 above, the Respondent restricted and/or excluded the Applicant from having access to her First Nations Parents, family group and/or community and/or connection to kin, country and culture.

Particulars

The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraphs 12 and 13 above, including the particulars to those paragraphs.

16. The matters set out in paragraph 15 above were wholly or partly because of or a function of the Applicant's race or the race of one or more of the Applicant's First Nations Parents and/or family group.

Particulars

The Applicant was denied access to her First Nations culture, community and language.

The Applicant was denied access to and separated from her First Nations Parents and family group.

The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraphs 10, 12, and 13 above, including the particulars to those paragraphs.



17. The matters set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 above had the effect of nullifying and/or impairing the Applicant's recognition, enjoyment or exercise of her fundamental human rights and freedoms.
- ~~16. The matters set out in paragraph 8 to 14 were in contravention of s 9 of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*.~~

Particulars

The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to remain free from unlawful interference with her family, and her right to the protection of her family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to enjoy her own Culture and to use her own Language, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraphs 10, 12, and 13 above, including the particulars to those paragraphs.

18. The matters set out in paragraphs 10 to 17 were in contravention of s 9(1) of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*.

Particulars

The Respondent's actions after the Applicant's removal, in failing to place the Applicant into the care of a person or persons who were members of the Applicant's own family, community and/or family group and subsequent residential placements pursuant to ss 5C and 83 of the Act occurred wholly or partly because of or were a function of the Applicant's race, or the race of one or both of her First Nations Parents and/or family group.

The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraphs 16 above including the particulars.

19. Further to the above, when the Applicant's sister [REDACTED] was born in 2016, the Applicant was initially involved in her care, but the Respondent severed that care after a month and prevented the Applicant from having a relationship with [REDACTED].

Particulars



Particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

- ~~18. The matters set out in paragraph 17 above were wholly or partly because of or a function of the Applicant's race.~~
20. By reason of the matters set out in paragraph 19 above, the Respondent restricted and/or excluded the Applicant from having access to her First Nations Parents, family group and/or community and/or connection to kin, country and culture.
21. The matters set out in paragraphs 19 to 20 above were wholly or partly because of or a function of the Applicant's race or the race of one or more of the Applicant's sibling, First Nations Parents or family group.

Particulars

The Applicant was denied access to her First Nations culture, community and language.

The Applicant was denied access to and separated from her First Nations family group.

The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraph 10, 12, 13 and 19 above, including the particulars.

22. The matters set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 above had the effect of nullifying and/or impairing the Applicant's recognition, enjoyment or exercise of her fundamental human rights and freedoms.

Particulars

The Applicant refers to and repeats the particulars to paragraph 17 above.

23. The matters set out in paragraphs 20 to 22 above ~~17~~ were in contravention of s 9(1) of the *Racial Discrimination Act* 1975.

Particulars

The Respondent's actions in failing to place the Applicant into the care of a person or persons who were members of the Applicant's own family, community and/or family group pursuant to ss 5C and 83 of the Act occurred wholly or partly because of or were a function of the Applicant's race, or the race of one or both of her First Nations Parents, community and/or family group (as provided by ss 5C and 83(4)-(5) of the Act).



The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraph 16 above including the particulars.

~~The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to remain free from unlawful interference with her family, and her right to the protection of his family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.~~

~~The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to enjoy her own Culture and to use her own Language, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.~~

Loss of Cultural Connection

24. The Applicant requested the Respondent connect her to her Indigenous relatives on various occasions between 2017 and 2019.

Particulars

Particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

25. The Respondent made no, or no adequate, attempts to facilitate Family Healing with the Applicant's Indigenous family despite her requests to the Respondent.
26. While in the care of the Respondent the Applicant's cultural needs were not met as required by s 83 of the Act.

Particulars

The Applicant is presently unable to particularise her own specific losses of culture without information which is in the sole possession of the Respondent. Particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

27. The Respondent made no, or no adequate, attempts to provide the Applicant with opportunities to learn about and practise her Aboriginal Culture, to know her Aboriginal Language, and to know her traditional Aboriginal Country.

Particulars

The Applicant is presently unable to particularise her own specific losses of culture without information which is in the sole possession of the Respondent.



Particulars may be provided following discovery and evidence.

28. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 24 to 27 above, the Respondent restricted and/or excluded the Applicant from having access to her First Nations Parents, family group, community and/or a connection to her kin, country and culture.
29. The matters set out in paragraphs 24 to 27-20 to 23 above occurred wholly or partly because of or were a function of the Applicant's race or the race of one or more of the Applicant's First Nations Parents or family group.

Particulars

The Applicant was denied access to her First Nations culture, community and language.

30. The matters set out in paragraphs 28 and 29 above had the effect of nullifying and/or impairing the Applicant's recognition, enjoyment or exercise of her fundamental human rights and freedoms.

Particulars

The Applicant refers to and repeats the particulars to paragraph 17 above.

31. The matters set out in paragraph 24 to 30 20 to 23 were in contravention of s 9 of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*.

Particulars

The Respondent's actions in failing to make adequate attempts to place the Applicant into the care of a person or persons who were members of the Applicant's own family, community and/or family group pursuant to the Act occurred wholly or partly because of or were a function of the Applicant's race, or the race of one or both of her First Nations Parents, community and/or family group (as provided by ss 5C and 83(4)-(5) of the Act).

The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to remain free from unlawful interference with her family, and her right to the protection of his family



as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.

~~The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Applicant's right to enjoy her own Culture and to use her own Language, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.~~

32. Further to the Respondent's contraventions of the RDA, pursuant to s 10 of the Act, a child can only be a "child in need of protection" within the meaning of the Act if there is not at least one parent who is willing and able to protect the child.
33. Further or alternatively, pursuant to s 10 of the Act, a child born after the commencement date of the Act, is only a child in need of protection if he or she has suffered, is suffering, or is at unacceptable risk of harm and does not have a parent able and willing to protect the child from harm.
- ~~28. Pursuant to s 11(3) of the Act, "parent" in relation to Aboriginal children includes a person who under Aboriginal tradition is regarded as a parent of the child.~~
34. At no relevant time did ~~The Respondent make any~~ no or no any adequate investigations as to whether there was a First Nations Parent ~~person or persons who under Aboriginal tradition was regarded as a parent~~ of the Applicant who was willing and able to protect the Applicant from harm.
35. Accordingly, the Respondent did not know whether there was a First Nations Pparent within the meaning of the Act who was willing and able to protect the Applicant in breach of s 10 of the Act.
- ~~31. To make a Child Protection Order pursuant to s 59 of the Act, a Magistrate must be satisfied that the child the subject of the order is a child in need of protection within the meaning of s 10 of the Act.~~
- ~~32. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 29 and 30, in making a Child Protection Orders about the Applicant children pursuant to s 59 of the Act, a Magistrate could not have been satisfied that the Applicant was in need of protection within the meaning of s 10 of the Act.~~



36. Sections 5C and 83 of the Act create specific statutory duties owed by the Respondent to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children who are removed from their family and placed in care pursuant to the Act, including compliance with:
- a) the principle that if a child is to be placed in care, the child has a right to be placed with a member of the child's family group (the **Child Placement Principle**) (pursuant to s 5C(2)(c) and s 83(4)-(5) of the Act); and
 - b) the principle that a child has the right to be supported to develop and maintain a connection with the child's family, community, culture, traditions and language, particularly when the child is in the care of a person who is not an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person (the **Connection Principle**) (pursuant to s 5C(2)(e), s 83 of the Act).
37. If the Respondent has not made adequate investigations as to whether there is a First Nations Parent or a member of the child's family group to care for the child, it is not possible for the Respondent to comply with the Child Placement Principle or the Connection Principle.
38. Further-or alternatively, the Respondent's failure to make any or adequate investigations into whether there was a First Nations parent or member of the Applicant's family group to care for person falling with the definition of parent in s 11(3) of the Act in relation to the Applicant constituted a breach of the Child Placement Principles, and the Connection Principle set out in ss 5A, 5B and 5C and 83 of the Act.
39. By reasons of the breaches of the Child Placement Principle and the Connection Principle, the Applicant has suffered loss and damage.

Particulars

The Applicant lost any opportunity to grow up learning about her traditional Country.

The Applicant lost access to her First Nations Culture, Community and Language.

The Applicant lost her right to remain free from unlawful interference with her family, and her right to the protection of her family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.

The Applicant lost her right to enjoy her own Culture and to use her own Language, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.



Group Members

40. The Applicant further claims on behalf of those she represents pursuant to s 46 PB of the AHRC Act that the conduct of the Respondent, after removing a Group Member from their family and in failing to place each Group Members into the care of their First Nations Parents and/or family group, restricted and/or excluded Group Members from having access to their respective First Nations Parents, family group, community and/or a connection to kin, country and culture, in Child Removal Interventions pursuant to the Act, was because of or a function of the race of the removed children or their parents or both within the meaning of s 18 of the RDA. She claims that the Respondent's conduct in Child Removal Interventions is the same, similar, or related to the conduct which occurred in her case, and constituted discrimination contrary to s 9 of the RDA.

Particulars

Further Particulars to be provided following discovery and evidence, including expert evidence, and determination of the common questions.

The Respondent's conduct has had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of each group member's right to remain free from unlawful interference with their family, and their right to the protection of their family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.

The Respondent's failures have had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of each group member's right to decide what kind of education their children receive, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

41. The matters set out in paragraphs 40 above were wholly or partly because of or a function of the Group Members' race or the race of one or more of the Group Members' First Nations Parents and/or family group.

Particulars

The Group Members were denied access to their First Nations culture, community and language.

The Group Members were denied access to and separated from their First Nations Parents and family group.



Further Particulars to be provided following discovery and evidence, including expert evidence, and determination of the common questions.

42. The matters set out in paragraphs 40 and 41 above had the effect of nullifying and/or impairing the Group Members' recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of their fundamental human rights and freedoms.

Particulars

The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Group Members' rights to remain free from unlawful interference with their family, and their right to the protection of their family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.

The Respondent's actions had the effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment, or exercise of the Group Members' right to enjoy their own Culture and to use their own Language, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

First Nations children in Queensland are subject to child protection services of the Respondent approximately 7.2 times more frequently than non-First Nations children.

43. Further, the Respondent did not permit, facilitate or adequately facilitate Family Healing between Group Members and their First Nations Parents and/or family group.

Particulars

Particulars of the Respondent's failure to permit, facilitate or adequately facilitate Family Healing may be provided after discovery, evidence including expert evidence, and determination of the common questions.

44. The Respondent's actions set out in paragraphs 40 to 43 were in contravention of s 9(1) of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*.
45. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 40 to 44 above, the Group Members have suffered loss and damage.

Particulars

The Group Members lost adequate access to their First Nations culture, community and language or that access was significantly impaired.



The group members lost their right to remain free from unlawful interference with their families, and their rights to the protection of their families as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, contrary to Art 23(1) of the ICCPR.

The group members lost their right to enjoy their own Cultures and to use their own Languages, contrary to Art 28 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Further Particulars to be provided following discovery and evidence, including expert evidence, and determination of the common questions.

46. Further to the Respondent's contraventions of the RDA, a child is only a child in need of protection within the meaning of the Act if he or she has suffered, is suffering, or is at unacceptable risk of harm and does not have a parent able and willing to protect the child from harm.
- ~~37. Pursuant to s 11(3) of the Act, "parent" in relation to Aboriginal children includes a person who under Aboriginal tradition is regarded as a parent of the child. Further, pursuant to s 11(4) of the Act, "parent" in relation to Torres Strait Islander children who, under Island custom, is regarded as a parent of the child (collectively "First Nations parents").~~
47. At no relevant time ~~During~~ the Children's Claim Period, did the Respondent make any ~~no~~, or any ~~no~~ adequate, investigations as to whether there was a person or persons who was a First Nations Parent able and willing to protect each group member from harm.
- ~~39. To make a Child Protection Order pursuant to s 59 of the Act, a Magistrate must be satisfied that the child the subject of the order is a child in need of protection within the meaning of s 10 of the Act.~~
- ~~40. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 37 to 39, in making any Child Protection Orders about a Group Member pursuant to s 59 of the Act, a Magistrate could not have been satisfied that the Group Member was a child in need of protection.~~
48. Section 5C and s 83 of the Act create specific statutory duties owed by the Respondent to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children removed from their family by the Respondent to place that child in care pursuant to each of the Child Placement Principle and the Connection Principle.

Particulars



The Applicant refers to and repeats paragraphs 36(a) to 36(b).

49. If the Respondent has not made adequate investigations as to whether there is a First Nations Parent and/or a member of the child's family group who is able and willing to care for that child, it is not possible for the Respondent to comply with the Child Placement Principle or the Connection Principle.
50. Further ~~or alternatively~~, whenever the Respondent's failure to make any or adequate investigations into whether there was a First Nations Parent or a member of a for each Group Member's family group, who was able and willing to care for the Group Member, there was a person falling with the definitions of parent in ss 11(3) and 11(4) of the Act in relation to their respective children constituted a it breached of the Child Placement Principles and the Connection Principle set out in ss 5A, 5B and 5C and 83 of the Act.
51. By reason of the matters set out in paragraphs 46 to 50 above each Group Member has suffered loss and damage.

Particulars

The Applicant refers to and repeats the particulars to paragraph 45.

Further Particulars to be provided following discovery and evidence, including expert evidence, and determination of the common questions.

Date: ~~12 November 2023~~

Signed by Jerry Tucker
Lawyer for the Applicant

This amended pleading was prepared by Dr K P Hanscombe KC, K Bowshell, M Kearney and M Benn of Counsel.

**Certificate of lawyer**

I, Jerry Tucker, certify to the Court that, in relation to the statement of claim filed on behalf of the Applicant, the factual and legal material available to me at present provides a proper basis for each allegation in the pleading.

Date: ~~12 November 2023~~

Signed by Jerry Tucker
Lawyer for the Applicant