



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEWCASTLE
AUSTRALIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE LEGAL CENTRE [UNLC]

Conducted by the Newcastle Law School

Level 5, NUspace

409 Hunter Street (Cnr Auckland St)

NEWCASTLE NSW 2300

Telephone: + 61 2 49218666

Email: legalcentre@newcastle.edu.au

Law Reform:

Removing Unnecessary Criminalisation: Reform of Court Election Withdrawal

About the University of Newcastle Legal Centre

The University of Newcastle Legal Centre (UNLC) is a community legal centre and teaching law firm dedicated to improving access to justice across the Hunter region. As part of the School of Law and Justice, the UNLC provides free legal assistance to disadvantaged and community members while offering practical legal education for law students.

The UNLC provides legal advice, casework and advocacy across criminal and traffic matters, administrative law, family violence, elder law, civil law, employment, and discrimination. Our work prioritises individuals experiencing financial hardship, systemic disadvantage, language barriers, disability or other vulnerabilities that limit their ability to navigate the legal system.

Students work under the supervision of experienced solicitors, gaining practical legal experience while contributing to high quality, trauma informed legal services. This integrated model combines community service, legal education and social justice advocacy in a way that strengthens both our clients and the broader community.

Specialist programs and initiatives

The University of Newcastle Legal Centre operates several specialised programs, including:

- **Law on the Beach**, an innovative summer clinic that provides accessible legal advice in community settings
- **Outreach services**, including programs developed to support older people who remain in hospital pending essential legal documents such as Powers of Attorney and Enduring Guardianships, and partnerships with Dementia Care nurses to ensure tailored legal support for clients with cognitive decline
- **Older Person Legal Clinics**, a specialist elder-law program providing legal assistance to older people experiencing vulnerability, isolation or complex legal needs.
- **Law reform and policy submissions**, contributing to systemic change by addressing barriers to justice identified through our client work.

Each of these programs reflects our commitment to empowering individuals, strengthening communities and promoting legal processes that are fair, transparent and accessible.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the lands on which we live, learn and work across the Hunter region and broader New South Wales. We pay our respects to Elders past and present. This is, was and always will be Aboriginal land.

We also acknowledge the individuals and communities experiencing hardship, discrimination and systemic barriers whose experiences inform our clinical teaching, our service delivery and our advocacy for law reform.

Introduction

1. This proposal examines the structural problems created by the lack of a comprehensive statutory mechanism to withdraw a court election after it has been lodged. It argues that the current system disproportionately criminalises individuals for minor regulatory offences, creates avoidable convictions and imposes long term consequences that far exceed the nature and seriousness of the original conduct.
2. The analysis draws upon principles of proportionality, access to justice, administrative fairness and the rehabilitative aims of the criminal justice system. It highlights particular impacts on vulnerable populations who frequently engage with the fines system.

The Current Court Election Framework in NSW

3. Under the *Fines Act 1996* (NSW), when a penalty notice is issued a person has the choice to:
 - a. pay the fine
 - b. seek a review from the issuing authority
 - c. apply for a Work and Development Order to pay the fine
 - d. elect to have the matter decided by a court
4. Once a person elects court, the matter is removed from the administrative fines system. Historically, the legislation did not provide any ability to withdraw that election. Even if the person later realised the election was mistaken, uninformed or impulsive, the process was irreversible.

Recent NSW Government Reform and Its Limitations

5. In February 2026, the NSW Government has recently taken a positive but limited step by introducing a 21-day withdrawal period for individuals who have elected to have a penalty notice dealt with at court. Under this reform, a person may revoke their court election within 21 days of lodging it, provided the matter has not yet been listed or progressed in the court system. After the 21-day period expires, Revenue NSW will issue the Court Attendance Notice, and there is no mechanism to withdraw the election beyond this point.
6. The Minister for Finance reinforced this in the Legislative Council:

“The Commissioner... must delay the issuing of a court attendance notice for at least 21 days,” after which the matter proceeds.
7. Parliament expressly recognised this problem in the second reading speech. The Hon. Michael Daley MP (Attorney General) stated:

“Once a person elects to go to court, there is currently no legislative mechanism to withdraw that election... At that point they are stuck with no way back and facing the possibility of a worse outcome than before.”¹

8. While this amendment is an important acknowledgment that the previous system was too rigid and punitive, it does not go far enough. The 21-day window fails to address the real-world circumstances faced by many people interacting with the fines system.
9. As a community legal centre, we consistently see individuals who arrive at court distressed, confused and unaware they have locked themselves into a process that exposes them to the risk of conviction.

NSW Traffic and Vehicle Regulatory Offence Statistics (2023–24)

10. Traffic and vehicle regulatory offences form the largest category of criminal matters finalised in New South Wales. In 2023–24:
 - These offences accounted for 39 percent of all defendants finalised in NSW, representing 63,011 individuals.²
 - This makes traffic and regulatory matters the single most frequent pathway into the criminal courts for NSW residents.
11. In New South Wales in 2023–24, 94 percent of defendants whose matters reached a judgment were found guilty.³
12. Fines were the most common penalty imposed on convicted defendants, and the Australian Bureau of Statistics reports a median fine amount of 500 dollars.⁴
13. These statistics show that minor traffic and regulatory offences are a dominant component of Local Court workloads, and that once a matter is before the court the likelihood of a conviction is extremely high. Many of these offences originate as simple penalty notices, meaning court election increases the consequences dramatically and unnecessarily.

¹ New South Wales, *Parliamentary Debates*, Legislative Assembly, 22 October 2025, 14:32 (Michael Daley, Attorney General) [Second Reading Speech, Fines Legislation Amendment Bill 2025], citing Legislative Assembly Hansard 22 October 2025 - Proof (pp 1–2).

² *Australian Bureau of Statistics*, Criminal Courts, Australia, 2023–24 financial year (Web Page, 9 April 2025) <<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/criminal-courts-australia/2023-24>>; *Australian Bureau of Statistics*, ‘Defendants Finalised, New South Wales (Tables 16–21)’, *Criminal Courts, Australia, 2023–24* (Data File, 9 April 2025) <<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/criminal-courts-australia/2023-24/4.%20Defendants%20finalised%2C%20New%20South%20Wales%20%28Tables%2016%20to%2021%29.xlsx>>.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

Why the 21-day limit is insufficient

People often do not understand the consequences until their court date

14. Many individuals only appreciate the seriousness of the situation when they arrive at court or after court sentencing. For vulnerable clients, this realisation often occurs well after the 21-day withdrawal period has expired.

Vulnerable clients are disproportionately disadvantaged by short deadlines

15. The people most likely to court elect are those least able to navigate strict administrative timeframes. This includes individuals experiencing:
- Homelessness
 - unstable accommodation
 - mental health crises
 - cognitive impairment
 - domestic violence
 - chaotic life circumstances
 - limited literacy or language skills
16. Meeting a 21-day deadline is unrealistic for many.

People frequently misinterpret the fine or election form

17. Community legal centre workers frequently encounter people who court elect because of misunderstandings such as:
- believing court is the only way to contest the fine
 - thinking the court would offer more time to pay
 - not realising minor infractions become criminal matters in court
18. Many people believe the court can consider intention, honest mistakes or a good driving record, unaware that most traffic offences are strict liability. They court-elect expecting these factors to assist, but the court can consider them only in a limited way, as strict liability offences leave little room for subjective considerations.
19. When they understand their mistake, the withdrawal period has already expired.

Many people are unaware the withdrawal option exists

20. The 21-day rule has not been widely publicised.
21. People with limited English, disability, low literacy or high stress are even less likely to know this right exists.

Life circumstances delay action

22. People in crisis often do not open mail promptly or respond quickly to bureaucratic notices.

23. Hospitalisation, incarceration, domestic upheaval, relapse, homelessness or mental health deterioration can all prevent timely action.
24. The rigid 21-day period does not accommodate these realities.

Legal Aid availability is very limited for traffic matters.

25. Legal Aid is generally not available for advice about court electing minor traffic infringements. Funding is only granted in limited circumstances⁵, usually when:
- there is a real possibility of imprisonment
 - the matter involves serious traffic charges (i.e. dangerous driving causing death or injury, high-range drink driving, driving while disqualified)
 - the case raises complex legal issues
 - the applicant meets the strict Simplified Means Test and hardship criteria
26. Because of these restrictions, most people considering a court election for minor traffic offences cannot access Legal Aid for early advice about the risks or alternatives.

Community Legal Centres demands limit timely advice

27. Community legal centres may provide advice about court elections, but high demand often means clients cannot obtain help within the 21-day withdrawal period. Delays occur because:
- appointments are limited due to heavy demand and finite staffing
 - urgent casework, court duty services and outreach commitments reduce immediate availability
 - many people only seek help after receiving their Court Attendance Notice, or on the day of court
 - clients experiencing crisis, illness, homelessness or family violence may not seek advice early enough

As a result, many individuals learn about the risks of court election after the withdrawal period has already expired, and generally at their first mention date.

Observations from the community legal sector

28. As community legal centre staff attending Local Court regularly, we see individuals who:
- attend court intending to pay the fine rather than risk a conviction
 - express confusion about why a minor administrative matter is now a criminal matter
 - experience fear, anxiety or shame at the possibility of a criminal record
 - believe they can reverse the court election on the day
 - have no legal representation and do not understand the sentencing risks

⁵ Legal Aid NSW, Crime Policy - Local Court (Web Page, accessed 5 March 2026)
<<https://www.legalaid.nsw.gov.au/for-lawyers/policy-online/crime-policies/crime-policy-local-court>>.

29. Many clients tell us they elected court more than 21-days earlier and had no idea they could have resolved the matter administratively. For these individuals, the 21-day rule is meaningless because they seek help only once the court date arrives.
30. We also see clients who travel significant distances or attend court under distressing personal circumstances, only to learn they cannot return their matter to Revenue NSW. They often leave court with a recorded conviction for matters never intended to be criminalised.

Why full flexibility is necessary

31. To genuinely protect vulnerable people from unnecessary criminalisation, the law must allow withdrawal:
- at any time up to and including the court date, and
 - at court before the matter is called.
32. A fair withdrawal mechanism would ensure that no one receives a criminal conviction simply because they misunderstood a form, missed a short deadline or experienced hardship that prevented timely action.

Why People Elect Court

33. Many defendants elect court for reasons unrelated to wanting a hearing, including:
- financial hardship and difficulty paying the fine
 - belief that court is the only avenue to seek leniency
 - misunderstanding of the election form
 - stress, panic or cognitive impairment at the time of receiving the fine
 - influence of peers or family
 - confusing or bureaucratic notices.
34. This issue disproportionately affects people with poor literacy, intellectual disability, acquired brain injury or limited English language skills.

CASE STUDY 1:

Parent Stopping in a No-Stopping Zone

A parent received a penalty notice for stopping in a no-stopping zone outside a school while waiting to collect his daughter. The school was running later than usual, and he remained in the zone for longer than the permitted brief set-down period. Believing the court might take the circumstances into account and reduce the penalty, he elected to have the matter determined in the Local Court.

At court, the magistrate imposed a fine of \$500, which exceeded the original penalty notice amount. This meant a criminal conviction was recorded even though the driver had only a limited traffic history and no previous criminal history. This type of conduct would not ordinarily justify a higher-than-standard penalty. The increased fine resulted from the court's broad sentencing discretion rather than any aggravating features of the offence.

In addition to the elevated fine, the driver was required to pay mandatory court costs and the Victims Support Levy. These additional fees brought the total financial burden well above the amount of the original infringement. Had the driver obtained legal advice earlier, he would have been advised to withdraw the court election within the permitted period and accept the penalty notice to avoid unnecessary financial consequences.

This example highlights how minor regulatory breaches, particularly those arising from everyday parenting responsibilities, can result in disproportionately high financial penalties when individuals mistakenly court elect the penalty notice due to a misunderstanding.

Why Lack of Withdrawal Is Problematic

Court attendance risks conviction for low level offences

35. Penalties that begin as penalty notices are generally minor. Examples include minor speeding offences, transport offences, parking offences, bicycle offences, minor licence breaches, littering and other regulatory matters.
36. Once brought before the Local Court, they become criminal matters. A person with no criminal history can walk into court for a minor fine and leave with a conviction because they mistakenly elected court.

Conviction in absence

37. If a person cannot attend court, the court may convict them in their absence.

Nonattendance often arises from:

- Homelessness
- lack of transport
- mental health crisis
- misunderstanding of the court notice

- fear or anxiety
- caring responsibilities

38. These individuals never intended to risk a criminal conviction. They simply did not grasp the implications of the election.

Disproportionate impact on vulnerable groups

39. Groups disproportionately affected include:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
- young people
- people experiencing homelessness
- individuals with disability
- people with mental health conditions
- newly arrived migrants

40. These individuals may elect court as a cry for help or because they seek human interaction with a system they do not understand. The inability to withdraw punishes them unfairly.

Impact on younger people

41. Young provisional licence holders are particularly vulnerable because any minor speeding offence can trigger an automatic licence suspension. This often leads them to court elect the fine under the mistaken belief that it is their only option to avoid suspension, unaware that they have other, more appropriate avenues to appeal the suspension.

42. Parliament also recognised that many people elect court impulsively or without understanding the consequences. As stated in the Legislative Council:

“People... tick the box to elect to go to court straightaway... and after discussions... decide that is not the right course of action.”⁶

Increased court backlog and inefficient use of resources

43. Irrevocable court elections place unnecessary strain on the Local Court. Minor matters that could be resolved administratively require prosecutors, court staff and magistrates to devote time that would be better allocated to more serious issues.

Hardship Caused by Criminal Convictions

44. A criminal conviction for a minor offence can create long term and disproportionate consequences.

⁶ New South Wales, *Parliamentary Debates*, Legislative Council, 5 February 2026, 14:42 (Scott Farlow) Second Reading Debate: Fines Legislation Amendment Bill 2025.

CASE STUDY 2:

Mobile Phone Offence Detected by Camera at Traffic Lights

A driver received a penalty notice for 'driver use mobile phone when not permitted (camera detected)' after briefly handling their phone while waiting at a red traffic light. Under the NSW penalty notice system, this offence carries a set fine and demerit points. Wanting to explain the circumstances and hoping for leniency, the driver elected to have the matter heard in the Local Court without obtaining legal advice.

At court, the magistrate imposed a fine exceeding \$800, which was substantially higher than the penalty notice amount. A criminal conviction was recorded as a result, but the driver's driving history was not poor enough to reasonably justify a penalty greater than the standard amount. The outcome reflected the court's wide sentencing discretion.

Had the driver received legal advice before the matter reached court, they would have been strongly advised to withdraw the court election and accept the original penalty notice. Because they were unaware of this option, they were left with a significantly higher financial penalty for a low-level traffic offence that was initially detected by camera while stationary at traffic lights.

In addition to the higher fine, the driver was required to pay mandatory court costs and the Victims Support Levy. These additional fees brought the total financial penalty to just under \$1000. Had the driver received legal advice before the matter proceeded, they would have been advised to withdraw the court election within the permitted period and retain the fixed infringement amount.

This case demonstrates how a minor mobile phone offence, detected by a camera while stationary at traffic lights, can escalate into a disproportionately high financial burden when a person mistakenly elects to go to court. It reinforces the importance of a more flexible withdrawal mechanism and clearer information for the public.

Employment impacts

45. Employers routinely conduct criminal record checks. A conviction may lead to:

- disqualification from certain roles
- rescinded job offers
- rejected applications
- reduced employability

46. Industries particularly affected include law, health, childcare, disability care, aged care, education, government, transport, finance, security and corrections.

Volunteering restrictions

47. Police checks prevent many people with convictions from volunteering in:

- Schools
- children's sport
- community organisations
- charity programs
- committees or boards

48. This exclusion undermines rehabilitation and community connection.

Social and community consequences

49. A criminal record may cause:

- Stigma
- difficulty obtaining rental housing
- ineligibility for programs
- anxiety, stress and long-term psychological harm
- reluctance to engage with police or justice agencies

50. Minor offences should not create lasting barriers to social participation.

Additional legal consequences

51. Convictions can affect:

- visa and citizenship applications
- insurance
- adoption or foster care eligibility
- licences or accreditation
- future sentencing outcomes

52. These consequences can be far more punitive than the original offence.

Increased financial burden

53. A court elected matter can also result in significantly higher financial costs. Defendants may face an increased penalty up to the legislative maximum, along with mandatory court costs and the Victims Support Levy. These additional expenses can turn a minor fine into a substantial financial burden, compounding the hardship associated with receiving a criminal conviction.

54. Parliament similarly noted that court election exposes individuals to “the possibility of much higher penalties than before,”⁷ even where the original conduct was minor.

⁷ NSW, LC, 5 February 2026, 14:31 (Courtney Houssos).

CASE STUDY 3:

Provisional Driver Exceeding the Speed Limit by <10 km/h

A young driver on their provisional licence received a penalty notice for travelling less than 10 km/h over the speed limit. For a P-plate driver, this penalty carries a demerit point that triggers an automatic licence suspension. Wanting to avoid being suspended, the young driver elected to have the fine dealt with in the Local Court.

The client made this election without legal advice and did not understand that electing court transformed the matter into a criminal proceeding. They also did not know that a conviction could be imposed for what began as a minor speeding infringement.

On the morning of the court mention, the client attended the duty lawyer clinic. During that advice, was informed for the first time of the full repercussions of court electing. They learned that the court could impose a conviction, that the matter would appear on their criminal record, and that they would be required to disclose the conviction for employment, volunteering or international travel. The client immediately stated that, had they understood this earlier, they would never have elected the fine to court.

They were also advised that they had pursued the wrong pathway. Instead of electing the fine itself, they should have elected the licence suspension to be reviewed by the Local Court. Had they done so, they likely would have achieved a significantly better outcome, including a reduced suspension period or possibly having the suspension quashed completely. Importantly, that pathway did not involve any risk of a criminal conviction.

However, because the 21-day withdrawal window had long expired, the client could not reverse the court election. They were forced to proceed.

At court, the magistrate imposed a fine and recorded a conviction. The offence is not serious, but it now appears on the client's criminal record permanently. This means the client will need to disclose it on many job applications and when leaving Australia on certain visa or travel forms. These consequences are significantly harsher than the administrative penalty they sought to avoid.

This case shows how quickly a minor traffic infringement can escalate into a lifelong criminal record for a young driver. The client's misunderstanding, combined with the inability to withdraw the court election after receiving proper legal advice, directly caused an outcome that was avoidable, disproportionate and fundamentally unfair.

Principles Supporting Reform

Proportionality

55. Punishment should fit the offence. Minor regulatory breaches, such as a single demerit point or minor speeding offence, should not escalate into criminal convictions that follow a person for life. A criminal record is a disproportionate response to conduct originally dealt with by a penalty notice.
56. When the underlying behaviour is low risk, unintentional or administrative in nature, the justice system should avoid outcomes that produce lifelong harm. Ensuring proportionality requires reforming court-election laws so that people are not thrust into the criminal justice system simply because of procedural rigidity or misunderstanding.

Administrative fairness

57. Individuals should not be trapped in a legal process due to inflexible procedures. The inability to withdraw a court election after the 21-day period creates a rigid system that fails to account for human error, literacy barriers, disability, stress and the realities of crisis situations. Administrative fairness requires systems that allow individuals to correct mistakes and make informed decisions. A fair fines system must provide transparent pathways, flexibility and opportunities to rectify an incorrect election without exposing people to criminal conviction.
58. In the Legislative Council, Hon. Courtney Houssos MLC described the withdrawal period as:
- “a simple, reasonable safeguard that reflects modern principles of administrative fairness.”⁸
59. This directly supports extending the safeguard to the first court mention date.

Access to justice

60. A fair system must enable people to correct mistakes. Many people court-elect fines under pressure or misunderstanding, particularly young provisional licence holders who believe court is the only way to prevent suspension. Access to justice requires ensuring that people can understand their rights, receive clear and timely information, and have practical mechanisms for reversing an uninformed decision.
61. Allowing withdrawal of a court election up to and including the mention enables access to justice by aligning the system with real human decision-making and the timing of when people typically seek legal help.
62. As noted by the Hon. Cameron Murphy MLC:

⁸ NSW, LC, 5 February 2026, 14:31 (Courtney Houssos).

“Most traffic matters are criminal offences... people often decide to challenge a fine thinking it is unfair... not realising that they will end up with a criminal conviction because they locked into a process.”⁹

63. This reinforces the need to prevent minor regulatory matters from generating lifelong criminal records.

Rehabilitation and reintegration

64. The criminal justice system should promote social inclusion, not undermine it. A conviction for a low-level regulatory offence can impede employment, volunteering, housing, education and travel. These barriers undermine the very principles of rehabilitation and reintegration by creating obstacles that make it harder for individuals to fully participate in community life. Ensuring that minor infringements do not unnecessarily result in criminal records supports better long-term social and economic outcomes for individuals and the community.

Recommended Legislative Reforms

Introduce a statutory right to withdraw a court election

65. Withdrawal should be permitted:

- up to and including the day before the first mention, and
- at court before or when the matter is called.

66. Parliament itself explained the purpose of the reform:

“By introducing a right to withdraw a court election... we are giving individuals the opportunity to correct course without unnecessary cost or consequence.”¹⁰

67. A meaningful withdrawal mechanism must reflect how and when people access legal advice. Many individuals do not seek help until the day of their first court appearance, often because of confusion, anxiety or unstable life circumstances. Allowing withdrawal prior to or at court, ensures that no person is forced into a criminal proceeding solely because they misunderstood the process or missed an administrative deadline.

68. Expanding the withdrawal right also reduces unnecessary use of court resources by enabling matters to return to the administrative fines system before judicial time is taken up. This supports judicial efficiency, lowers prosecutorial workloads and prevents the courts from being used as a default avenue for managing administrative errors or misunderstandings.

⁹ NSW, LC, 5 February 2026, 15:11 (Cameron Murphy).

¹⁰ NSW, LA, 22 October 2025, 14:32 (Michael Daley).

69. A statutory right must be simple, accessible and universally applied, ensuring that all defendants have a realistic opportunity to correct mistaken elections regardless of age, background or personal circumstances.

Automatic reinstatement to the administrative fines system

70. Once withdrawn, the matter should return to Revenue NSW and be eligible for payment. At this point, it should also be mandated that clear, plain-English information about payment options, including instalment arrangements, be provided again to the individual to ensure they understand their choices.
71. Reinstating matters to the administrative fines' pathway ensures that individuals are not penalised for initially choosing the wrong mechanism. Many court-elected matters involve people who simply needed more time to pay, an instalment arrangement or a Work and Development Order. Returning the matter to Revenue NSW reinstates these options and prevents the unnecessary criminalisation of low-level conduct.
72. Administrative reinstatement also ensures procedural fairness by placing the individual back in the position they would have been in had they never made the mistaken court election. This is especially important for younger drivers who court-elect due to misunderstanding, as well as those experiencing cognitive impairment, mental health issues or financial stress.
73. The process for reinstatement should be automatic and administrative, requiring no additional applications, forms or time delays beyond the withdrawal itself. This promotes fairness and reduces administrative burden on both defendants and the justice system.

Targeted protections for vulnerable individuals

74. This includes:
- clear reminders of the consequences of a court election
 - accessible communication materials
 - support for individuals with cognitive, mental health or literacy issues
75. Vulnerable individuals are significantly overrepresented in court-elected matters. Many elect court because they do not understand the notice, misinterpret the options or believe attending court is their only chance to be heard.
76. Targeted protections should include:
- Plain-language notices that highlight the risk of conviction and the alternative pathways available.
 - Visual, multilingual and Easy Read versions of election forms to support those with limited literacy or English proficiency.
 - Proactive warnings sent via text or email (where possible) in the days after a court election, outlining the consequences and the right to withdraw.
 - Mandatory referrals to support services or legal assistance for people flagged as high-risk due to disability, cognitive impairment or socio-economic disadvantage.

77. Specialised communication strategies for provisional licence holders, who are disproportionately likely to court-elect due to misunderstanding of licence suspension pathways.
78. These targeted measures help ensure that people do not unintentionally expose themselves to criminal convictions due to communication barriers, stress or lack of support.

Conclusion

79. The current inability to withdraw a court election up to and including the first mention in a meaningful and flexible way leads directly to unnecessary criminal convictions for minor offences. These convictions carry lifelong consequences for employment, volunteering and social participation. The system disproportionately harms vulnerable people and strains court resources.
80. As summarised by Hon. Michael Daley MP (Attorney General):
- “Our system must see the person, not just the penalty... ensuring compassion and consistency work in harmony with compliance.”¹¹
81. Allowing withdrawal of a court election up to and including the first mention date is a simple, practical and compassionate reform that would improve fairness, reduce avoidable criminalisation and support the broader aims of justice in NSW.

Version	Date	Author	Notes
1.0	5 March 2026	Ben Nicholson	Initial consolidated submission draft

¹¹ Ibid.