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**Introduction**

The Media, Entertainment & Arts Alliance (MEAA), the union and industry advocate for Australia’s journalists, welcomes this opportunity to make a submission to the review of Victoria’s *Open Courts Act 2013* and the review’s consideration of whether the Act strikes the right balance between people’s privacy, fair court proceedings and the public’s right to know.

MEAA believes the Act, intended to address concerns that suppression orders were being made too frequently, has failed to achieve its aims.

MEAA has made recommendations to enable the suppression order system to operate properly.

**The media environment**

It is crucial to acknowledge the current media environment when discussing the current state of court reporting by media outlets.

In recent years media organisations have been confronted by enormous pressures. Due to the disruption caused by digital technology, media outlets are faced with declining revenues to fund editorial content.

Regular rounds of redundancies and other cost-cutting programs have dramatically reduced editorial resources and staff. While some new and niche media outlets have emerged, they operate with far fewer staff than metropolitan daily newspapers.

This media environment is putting dire pressure on the media as it tries to fulfil its role in a healthy functioning democracy:

* Across the board, there are far fewer journalist “boots on the ground” to report on issues in the public interest. Fewer reporters means less coverage of important issues, less time and opportunity to report, and a decline in the ability to properly scrutinise and pursue legitimate issues;
* the journalists who remain behind after the redundancy rounds have seen their workload intensify to the point where not only are they having to do more but new technology means they must also now file stories for a multitude of publishing platforms throughout the day as well as personally promote those stories on social media to push web traffic to their employer’s online news web site;
* the spate of redundancies has also seen the most senior and experienced journalists, who are also usually the most highly remunerated, pushed out of media companies by their employers, only to be replaced by less experienced journalists who may not be as highly trained and/or mentored as their predecessors;
* the competitive pressures that arise from digital technology have led to additional problems: the “rush to be first” with the news is a critical commercial imperative, and this, coupled with fewer production staff (sub-editors) to check news stories before they are published, means there are fewer checks and balances available in newsrooms; and
* media companies have fewer financial resources to fund a legal challenge to ensure a public interest news story is published or to defend themselves should an action be brought against a journalist and the media outlet.

There is no expectation that this dire situation will improve.

Indeed, the challenges outlined above are expected to exacerbate as the financial pressures continue to erode the way the media has traditionally functioned. Yet the expectation continues that the fourth estate must play its crucial role in a healthy functioning democracy.

There is no doubt that, despite the best intentions, the media’s reporting on the courts has suffered due to the pressures outlined above. Fewer experienced journalists are available; they are working under intense pressure to file stories while needing to be aware of the existence of court orders and, at times, operating under the intimidation of defamation actions and subpoenas that threaten their journalism and their sources.

MEAA believes that given this media environment will not necessarily ease, it is important that the courts and the media seek ways to work together in the public interest, to improve the ability to report on the courts, and for the court system to function with the public interest in mind.

**Conflict between the media and courts**

MEAA is concerned that for some time the courts have displayed a lack of understanding of the role of the media and disdain for the media’s concerns about the suppression order system. It is also apparent that many judicial officers operate under a presumption that it is the courts that should determine what is in the public interest.

In a speech delivered to the Melbourne Club in on Friday November 13 2009 (prior to the *Open Courts Act*), former Supreme Court Justice Betty King boasted that she was “probably responsible for the majority of suppression orders imposed in Victoria in the last three years”[[1]](#endnote-1) and that for every worthy media report there were equally reports that were “inaccurate, salacious, mischievous, morally indefensible and just plain prurient”*.*[[2]](#endnote-2)

These views are unhelpful. MEAA hopes such attitudes can be put behind us.

However, as recently as October 2015 Victorian Chief Justice Marilyn Warren[[3]](#endnote-3) wrote about the media’s challenging of suppression orders:

*It needs to be remembered that the media has its own interests here: it wants to attract readers, viewers and online participants. Crime sells.*

MEAA believes these remarks traduce the media to purely commercial entities while failing to acknowledge the public’s right to know.

MEAA also believes the Chief Justice’s comments fail to acknowledge the difficulties of the media’s current operating environment, as outlined above.

The narrow view expressed by the Chief Justice may go some way to explain some of the difficulties the media confronts with the suppression orders issued by Victorian courts.

**Too many orders**

The media’s major concerns with suppression orders have been their prevalence in Victoria.

It was hoped that the Act would remedy this propensity of the Victorian courts to make suppression orders so readily. However, a news story in *The Age* in October 2015[[4]](#endnote-4) stated:

*Victorian courts are still issuing hundreds of suppression orders a year, including blanket bans on information [that] prevent media organisations from even reporting that a case is underway, despite new legislation in 2013 called the "Open Courts Act".*

*The findings have prompted calls for a government-funded "Office of the Open Courts Advocate" to argue in courts against the suppression of information.*

In the financially straitened times that media organisations now find themselves, it is unreasonable to expect media outlets to constantly present themselves to the court in order to challenge each and every suppression order which are currently (as at February 2017) averaging “almost one a day for the court year”[[5]](#endnote-5).

 In November 2016 *The Age* editorialised:

*“… simply challenging suppression orders is not as easy as it sounds. One reason is the sheer number of such orders being issued – 254 across the Supreme Court, the County Court and the Magistrates Court in the year following the passage of the Open Courts Act in December 2013, which was supposed to limit the number.” [[6]](#endnote-6)*

 The newspaper went on to say:

*On top of this, the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal and the Coroner's Court also use suppression orders regularly "in the public interest" to stop publication of evidence.*

*And having lawyers appear in court on our behalf is not cheap. We do challenge some,* ***but expecting us to challenge the daily procession of suppression orders is increasingly unrealistic****.[[7]](#endnote-7)* [MEAA emphasis]

In response, Chief Justice Warren noted in the article cited above:

*Victoria is the only state that maintains a database of all suppression orders issued – so it is therefore difficult to compare the number of orders made here against other Australian jurisdictions.[[8]](#endnote-8)*

Despite this, the Chief Justice went on to claim:

*The Victorian Supreme Court figures are certainly on par with our New South Wales counterpart, however[[9]](#endnote-9).*

If that is so, then that is a concern. In March 2013 the *Gazette of Law and Journalism* reported a 1000% increase in the number of court suppression orders in NSW since 2008[[10]](#endnote-10).

There is evidence that the *Open Courts Act* has failed to reduce the number of orders being issued by Victorian courts. In his paper *Two Years of Suppression under the Open Courts Act 2013 (Vic)[[11]](#endnote-11)*, Melbourne Law School senior lecturer and deputy director of the Centre for Media and Communications Law at the University of Melbourne Jason Bosland noted: “What is apparent… is that the overall number of regular suppression order made by the courts per year has remained relatively stable… despite the introduction of the *OC Act*.”

In short, the Act is failing to make the operation of the courts more “open”.

Indeed, it is interesting to note the comments made by Justice Simon Whelan to the Melbourne Press Club[[12]](#endnote-12) in July 2015. He noted that the introduction of the *Open Court Act* had not led to judges issuing fewer suppression orders:

*“In Victoria we know how many orders we make and the number has not gone down. We really want to have a situation where we make very few orders… we could have less than we do… There is a problem about orders being made in relation to matters that are already addressed by legislation or the sub judice rule.*

Bosland goes on to note that under the Act, 63% of proceedings-only orders are “blanket bans” – the most extreme form of proceedings-only suppression orders that can be made by a court – mainly made in the Magistrate’s Court. Bosland states: “The data on the scope of the orders of orders is significant. It indicates that the *OC Act* has had no overall effect whatsoever in narrowing the scope of orders made by the courts… Furthermore given the extreme nature of such orders… it must be pointed out that it is highly improbably... that such a large proportion of blanket-ban orders in the dataset could be justified.”[[13]](#endnote-13)

It should also be noted that the Act operates on a presumption of open court. Section 28 of the Act states: “To strengthen and promote the principle of open justice, there is a presumption in favour of hearing a proceeding in open court to which a court or tribunal must have regard in determining whether to make any order, including an order under this Part that the whole or any part of a proceeding be heard in closed court or closed tribunal; or that only specified persons or classes of persons may be present during the whole or any part of a proceeding.”

**Specific recommendations regarding aspects of the Act being considered by the review:**

* *The notice requirements and their impact on the courts, and on the rights of other parties, including the media, to be heard;*

Section 11 (1) of the Act requires the Court or Tribunal to “take reasonable steps to ensure to ensure that any relevant news media organisation (a news media organisation which the court or tribunal would ordinarily ensure was sent notice of the making of a suppression order) is notified of the application for a suppression order.

However, a MEAA Media member and senior court reporter with a daily newspaper, commented as recently as February 2017:

*Another day, another suppression with no notice to media. It’s become standard practice to ignore* Open Courts.

MEAA recommends that consideration be given to improving the speed of notifications to news media outlets, with the possibility of some confirmation of receipt so that all parties are assured the media has been advised of the making of an order and that the order has been acknowledged.

MEAA also understands that the notification system that uses emails to send .pdf documents containing the suppression order to designated media outlet email addresses is not fully “searchable” by the media outlets. For instance, the names of those persons covered by the order are not always apparent in the subject heading or the text of the email and may be contained deep inside the .pdf document.

This means that media outlets cannot readily identify the individuals or matters covered by the suppression order, allowing for unwitting errors to be made.

MEAA strongly recommends that ways be sought to allow the notification system to provide initial necessary information that allows the media to readily identify persons and issues surrounding each suppression order, with the full details of the order to be included in depth in the .pdf document but that the database utilise a “search” function to allow media outlets to quickly identify and locate persons and issues included in the suppression order.

* *The grounds for a proceeding suppression order and whether they are adequate for the breadth of matters that come before the courts;*

MEAA is concerned that the courts are presuming they are the sole determinants of what is in the public interest. This is not so and the Act does not say this is a role for the courts (except for matters before the Coroners Court – see below).

Indeed, the comments of former Justice Betty King cited earlier including her noting that she had “stopped” a television current affairs news story because: “The educational content of this program is, in my view, non-existent. The public interest in having it played is, in my view, equally non-existent.”[[14]](#endnote-14) Judges should not be making decisions to make a suppression order to stop a news program on the grounds that they consider its content is not educational and not in the public interest.

Section 4 of the Act says there is “a presumption in favour of disclosure of information to which a court or tribunal must have regard in determining whether to make a suppression order”.

Under s18(2)(b) only the Coroners Court may make a proceeding suppression order or under s30(3) may make a closed court order if disclosure would be contrary to the public interest. MEAA contends that this exception is illogical and wrong and should be denied to the Coroners Court to ensure consistency throughout the Act.

As mentioned above, Bosland notes 63% of proceedings-only orders are blanket bans, up 11% from an earlier Bosland study that examined the making of suppression orders in Victoria prior to the *Open Courts Act*.

Bosland notes that “administration of justice” and “personal safety grounds” are the most frequently relied on for the making of suppression orders. But Bosland also notes that 31 orders in his dataset “did not specify the relevant statutory ground or grounds upon which they were made despite this being mandatory requirement of the *OC Act*”.[[15]](#endnote-15)

He adds: “Notably, 73% of orders (354/486) merely repeated the statutory grounds… Specifying the purpose in this manner fails to meet the requirement in s13(2) and is therefore inadequate. This is because s13(2) requires that *both* the purpose of an order *and* the grounds upon which it is made be specified in the order.”[[16]](#endnote-16)

MEAA believes the attitude of the courts towards the media displays a view that the courts are entitled to determine what is in the public interest. The Act does not support this approach and MEAA would contend that even where the Act does allow the Coroners Court to do so, this is wrong.

MEAA believes a Court must confine its determination on the making of an order to the scope of the Act and particularly the presumption in favour of disclosure of information as set out in section 4.

MEAA recommends that both the purpose and the grounds for the making of any suppression order must be clearly set out. Consideration should be given to ensure that the purpose and grounds are clear, specific and apply directly to reasoning for the making of an order. Vague, repetitive and non-specific grounds should be deemed inadequate.

* *The requirements that a suppression order must clearly specify the information to which the order applies;*

Section 13 of the Act requires that “a suppression order must specify the information to which the order applies with sufficient particularity to ensure that the order is limited to achieving the purpose for which the order is made; and the order does not apply to any more information than is necessary to achieve the purpose for which the order is made; and it is readily apparent from the terms of the order what information is subject to the order. A suppression order must specify the purpose of the order; and in the case of a proceeding suppression order… must specify the applicable ground or grounds on which it is made.”

It is clear that orders are being made that do not meet the requirements of section 13. *The Age* editorial cited earlier also examined the scope of the suppression orders being issued in such copious numbers:

*“… many of the orders – 37 per cent on our analysis last year – prevented reporting of any aspect of a case at all. As well, 9 per cent were still being issued without end dates (contrary to the terms of the* Open Courts Act*) and 7 per cent did not specify on what grounds they were granted.”[[17]](#endnote-17)*

MEAA believes that some orders are excessive in their scope and are unclear as to why they were made.

In the interests of the full disclosure that is the aim of the Act, MEAA recommends that the exact specifications of an order and the reasons behind a suppression order as well as its scope and timeframe must be satisfactorily stated and accepted before any order can be made and that these arguments be included as part of the notification system.

* *The requirement that a suppression order must operate for no longer than is reasonably necessary.*

MEAA hopes we never see the situation that arose in the Melbourne Magistrate’s Court in 2013 where a suppression order was made that prohibited the publication of any information that might identify a particular witness “in any media outlet, newspaper, radio, television or internet or any other publication for a period of 999 months”. As MEAA’s annual report into the state of press freedom in Australia noted: “Towards the end of the 21st century, one of our descendants can apply to the court to lift that order.”[[18]](#endnote-18)

Section 12(3) of the Act, states: “If the period for which a suppression order operates is specified by reference to a future event that may not occur, the order must also specify a period from the date of the order (not exceeding 5 years) at the end of which the order expires unless sooner revoked.” This appears to have led to courts lazily making orders to last for five years without justifying why that time frame has been chosen.

Bosland notes that a significant number of orders “did not contain an appropriate temporal limitation”. Several orders, particularly those issued in the County and Supreme Courts, were made to operate for a period of exactly five years.

Bosland says: “This is a curious result because in terms of necessity of duration, there is nothing significant about a five-year period of operation that would explain the prevalence of such orders… It appears that it came only be attributed to the wording in s12.”[[19]](#endnote-19)

MEAA recommends that suppression orders should be made for narrower time frames, not utilising timeframes of months or years (this to be determined by what the court determines as being practical). A narrower time frame should be the default and these time frames can only be extended by a subsequent application to the court, so that the emphasis is always on the disclosure of information at the earliest opportunity rather than ongoing suppression of information with little or no regard to the requirement to inform the public.

**The need for an independent contradictor**

As the then Attorney-General said during the second reading of the Open Courts Bill in June 2013:

*Free reporting by the media of what is happening in Victoria’s courts is vital to the community’s right to know.[[20]](#endnote-20)*

Specifically, section 11 of the Bill:

*requires the court or tribunal to take reasonable steps to ensure that relevant news media organisations are notified of an application for a suppression order where notice is given under clause 10.*

*The intention is that* ***because news media organisations are more likely to act as a contradictor to such applications, that this will provide courts and tribunals with the benefit of a contradictor making arguments in favour of the principle of open justice and disclosure of information*** *both in relation to whether the order should be made and, if made, its scope and duration.[[21]](#endnote-21)* [MEAA emphasis]

MEAA believes the second paragraph exposes a flaw in the thinking behind the Act.

The belief that “news media organisations are more likely to act as a contradictor” and that that would benefit the courts in providing them with someone to make arguments in favour of open justice and disclosure of information exposes a failure of section 4 of the Act:

*To strengthen and promote the principles of open justice and free communication of information, there is a presumption in favour of disclosure of information to which a court or tribunal must have regard in determining whether to make a suppression order.*

The news media should not be required to constantly monitor, analyse and consider potential and possible action about court cases that the media may believe are newsworthy and worth reporting. It should not be up to the news media to alone play the role of contradictor.

This responsibility assumed by the Act to be imposed on the media doubtless requires all news media organisation to not only be mindful of all applications for suppression order but to also have legal advice “on tap” to be able to assess and advise on whether a review of an order should be sought, and for news media to then fund legal actions to seek a review of an order.

In essence, the underlying belief of the Act is that the news media should be expected to act on suppression orders at every opportunity.

This is unreasonable. It is not a role that news media organisations should be expected to perform, particularly as they’re resources are already stretched in running their day-to-day business operations in the current tough environment for media businesses. The media should not be considered a judicial functionary – which is the underlying intention of the Act.

There is also a clear failing of the Act in its expectation that media organisations can litigate every order they oppose. The changed media environment means such resources are not available. And that means that the public’s right to know is being eroded.

The attitude of judges outlined in their unhelpful remarks cited above also suggests that even the courts themselves believe the media should always present itself in order before a court to oppose an order without understanding that the media is being swamped with suppression orders and is incapable of mounting expensive legal challenges to them. The judge’s own perspective is that the media is the contradictor.

It is interesting to note that the Chief Justice indirectly acknowledged this problem, when she said:

*To further strengthen public confidence in the process, the Supreme Court will soon utilise a generous service of the Victorian Bar, where barristers will appear – free of charge – when requested by a judge, to make submissions on public interest grounds, in the absence of any other contradictors such as the media. This is an initiative of the courts themselves together with the Victorian Bar, one of the state's most highly respected independent legal bodies.*

This “service” amply demonstrates the confused perspective: if the media doesn’t turn up to play contradictor, a barrister will appear when requested by a judge. The Chief Justice’s point again demonstrates that this is about trying to create a stop-gap remedy rather than deal with the media’s legitimate concerns about the number of suppression orders being issued and the inability of the media to cope with challenging every one.

A wiser course would be the creation of an Office of the Open Courts Advocate to argue the public interest during the making of an order.

MEAA strongly recommends the creation of an Office of the Open Courts Advocate to argue the public interest in suppression order considerations – in advance of the issuing of the order and at any subsequent review of an order.

This Advocate should play the role of contradictor and fill the gap formerly occupied by media lawyers representing media outlets – to argue for the public interest. This does not mean that media outlets will be frozen out from such debate. The media should always be afforded the opportunity to argue its position.

However the public interest must be better served by having a contradictor in place to argue its case.

MEAA acknowledges that this will require not inconsiderable resources to be allocated into the creation and funding of an Office of Open Courts Advocate. However, to do otherwise places an unfair and unreasonable burden on media outlets. The public interest and the public’s right to know should never be compromised because of a lack of resources.

**Training**

MEAA welcomes the suggestion made in the review’s Terms of Reference that “further training for courts and tribunals would be helpful”.

MEAA believes training courses developed by the courts and media employers for journalists as well as for courts and tribunals would be mutually beneficial.

For media personnel in the current environment it is vital they learn about the duties and responsibilities of the media when reporting court matters, particularly to avoid any activities that may result in a mistrial or contempt of court.

Similarly, training in the role of the media and how professional journalists work as well as consideration of public interest matters from the media’s perspective may assist the courts and tribunals to better manage the consideration of suppression order applications.

**Need for a roundtable discussion**

It is clear that the media and the courts must work better together. They have a mutual concern for the conduct of justice and the public’s right to know.

MEAA believes that while the Act has had good intentions, it has not been successful at resolving many of the concerns the media have with the way the suppression order regime operates in Victoria’s court. There are too many orders being issued, the grounds on which they are being issued seem weak; at times the attitudes of the courts appears to be against the media or at the very least fail to understand the role of the media and the role the media plays in the public’s right to know.

The expectation of the courts and of the Act itself is that the media has the ability and resources to seemingly endlessly litigate orders (particularly when so many are being issued). This is wrong.

MEAA believes that an Office of the Open Courts Advocate be created to argue the public interest while an order is being sought and before an order has been made.

MEAA believes that the public’s right to know through public and media access to open courts is crucial to the functioning of a healthy democracy.

To this end, MEAA further proposes a roundtable of representatives of the state government, the courts and the media meet to examine ways to improve relations for the best outcomes for the operation and reporting of the courts.

This should include ways make the suppression order system manageable from the perspectives of both the courts and media outlets, particularly in devising better communications on the existence and particulars of suppression orders.

**Need for a national discussion**

In preparing this submission, MEAA has noted that the number of suppression orders made in Victoria since the creation of the Act has not reduced. There would seem to be a general acceptance that Victorian courts make far too many suppression orders for what would seem reasonable given the case load of Victorian courts. Bosland’s paper provides ample evidence that many orders are being made without giving a proper explanation of the grounds for the order and that time frames for orders are often excessive.

But MEAA also notes that Victoria is not alone in making an excessive number of orders. South Australia, in particular, appears to issue far more suppression orders that the case load of its court system would appear to warrant. By contrast, the number of orders issued in Western Australia and Queensland are in single digits despite having, presumably, a far greater case load based on their population compared to South Australia’s.

MEAA believes that there is clearly a propensity for some jurisdictions to make suppression orders while other jurisdictions are more cautious or averse to making such orders.

MEAA believes that in an era of digital publishing where news stories, including court cases, can be published to audiences beyond the state and territory borders of a particular jurisdiction, the excessive use of suppression orders is undermining the public’s right to know beyond the borders of the jurisdiction of where the order was made.

The more frequent use of suppression orders in a particular jurisdiction effectively muzzles media reporting whereas the reporting of an identical case in another jurisdiction would be unlikely to be suppressed.

MEAA believes consideration should be given for a discussion by the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council of the Council of Australian Governments for a way to develop a uniform national approach to suppression orders so that the current massive imbalance in the issuing of orders can be addressed.

This should be seen as necessary to ensure the public’s right to know is protected regardless of the jurisdiction.

It must also ensure that the media’s court reporting in the digital era allows court cases to be reported rather than suppressed.
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