

EDITORIAL NOTE: CHANGES MADE TO THIS JUDGMENT APPEAR IN [SQUARE BRACKETS].

This judgment cannot be republished without permission of the Court. Publication of this judgment on the Youth Court website is NOT permission to publish or report.  
See: [Districtcourts.govt.nz](http://Districtcourts.govt.nz)

**NOTE: NO PUBLICATION OF A REPORT OF THIS PROCEEDING IS PERMITTED UNDER S 438 OF THE ORANGA TAMARIKI ACT 1989, EXCEPT WITH THE LEAVE OF THE COURT THAT HEARD THE PROCEEDINGS, AND WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PUBLICATIONS OF A BONA FIDE PROFESSIONAL OR TECHNICAL NATURE THAT DO NOT INCLUDE THE NAME(S) OR IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS OF ANY CHILD OR YOUNG PERSON, OR THE PARENTS OR GUARDIANS OR ANY PERSON HAVING THE CARE OF THE CHILD OR YOUNG PERSON, OR THE SCHOOL THAT THE CHILD OR YOUNG PERSON WAS OR IS ATTENDING. SEE**

**<http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1989/0024/latest/DLM155054.html>**

**IN THE YOUTH COURT  
AT MANUKAU**

**I TE KŌTI TAIOHI  
KI MANUKAU**

**CRI-2017-292-000495  
[2019] NZYC 88**

**NEW ZEALAND POLICE**  
Prosecutor

v

**[AZ]**  
Young Person

Hearing: 18 January 2019  
Appearances: S Norrie and Y Olsen for the Prosecutor  
C Bennett for the Young Person  
Judgment: 28 February 2019

---

**DECISION OF JUDGE J H LOVELL-SMITH**

---

[1] The young person, [AZ] has not denied two charges:

- (a) Aggravated robbery pursuant to s 235(a) of the Crimes Act 1961, carrying a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment; and
- (b) Wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm, pursuant to s 188(1) of the Crimes Act 1961, carrying a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment.

[2] The Young Person was born on [date deleted] 2002. At the time of the offending he was [over 15 years old]. At the time of the hearing he is [over 16 years old].

[3] There is no issue that this was very serious offending which has had long term effects on the victim. The issue is whether the young person remains in the Youth Court or is convicted and transferred to the District Court for sentence as remaining in the Youth Court be “clearly inadequate” in terms of s 289(1) of the Act. Such an assessment must be made in light of the principles of keeping young people in the community and imposing the least restrictive sanction appropriate.

[4] The Summary of Facts is accepted:

#### **Introduction**

The Young Person involved in this matter is the 15 year old [AZ] who is not known to the Victim, [over 30] year old [MV].

#### **Circumstances**

At about 5:40 pm on the 4<sup>th</sup> of October 2017 [AZ] and an associate of his flagged down a bus driver by the Victim on [street 1 deleted].

When the bus stopped [AZ] told the Victim that he wanted to go to [location deleted] and that he would pay him when they got there.

[AZ] and his associate entered the bus and walked to the rear where they found vacant seats.

The Victim continued on driving but as he turned onto [street 2 deleted] from [street 1], [AZ] got up from his seat and stood right next to him.

[AZ] pulled out a pocket knife and showed it to the Victim, threatening him.

He then held the blade of the knife against the Victim's throat.

Having the knife still drawn, [AZ] began to tamper with the cash till until it dropped to the ground.

He uplifted the till and began emptying the cash into his jacket pocket.

After obtaining the case, [AZ] told the Victim to stop the bus.

The Victim continued driving along [street 2] for a short distance while [AZ] stood next to him with the blade of the pocket knife still drawn.

The Victim stopped the bus immediately after reaching the intersection of [street 3 deleted] and [street 2].

Once the doors to the bus were opened, [AZ] approached the Victim once more and grabbed the back of the Victim's neck with his right hand.

Holding the pocket knife in his left hand he slashed the Victim's throat.

[AZ] then stabbed the Victim twice in the body before getting off the bus with his associate.

[AZ] and his associate were subsequently located a short distance away at an address on [street 3].

### **Injuries to Victim**

The Victim is currently undergoing surgery and the full extent of his injuries are not yet known however medical staff have indicated that he has two stab wounds to his body, one which has pierced his spleen. He also has a superficial laceration approximately 7 cm in length across his the front of his neck.

[5] I have read the victim impact report dated 26 October 2018. The victim is a [over 30] year old male who worked as a bus driver. He did not know the person who attacked him. As a result of the attack, he was stabbed twice and had his throat cut. He was admitted to hospital and underwent major surgery to remove his spleen as during the stabbing his spleen was damaged and would not stop bleeding. Although, it has been nearly a year since the attack he was still in pain. He has been referred to a spine specialist but is still waiting for an appointment.

[6] ACC has covered the victim's financial costs, however, the victim has found it difficult to move on due to the pain. He is still not able to work. He cannot do anything that involves heavy lifting or drive a bus. There are days where his family and he want to go and do something like they used to but cannot due to the pain. He has bad days and wonders why it happened to him but if it did not happen to him it would have

happened to somebody else. He said he just want to put this behind him and to carry on with his life.

[7] The young person has no prior history in the Youth Court.

## **Psychological Reports**

### *Section 333 report dated 6 December 2017*

[8] A s 333 report dated 6 December 2017 by Bridget Fleming, Dr Clare Calvert and Alaelua Taulapapa Leasoiloaifalepolu Malesala was obtained to determine whether the young person was unfit to stand trial. Their conclusions were as follows:

(a) Intellectual Disability:

The Young person's full scale IQ was in the very low range – 73. He did not meet the criteria for an intellectual disability as defined in s 7 of the IDCCR Act 2003.

(b) Mental Disorder:

The young person does not meet criteria for a mental disorder under the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992. There is no evidence he suffered from a major mood disorder nor that he was experiencing any psychotic symptoms which might severely diminish his capacity to care for himself nor was he on the Autistic Spectrum.

The young person does not meet the criteria for mood, anxiety or psychotic disorder. He was elevated on the depression and anger scales and did report current levels of anxiety. Given his level of stress, his report of suicidal ideation in the community and his heavy substance abuse, he was assessed at being of increased risk of developing serious mental health issues. The diagnosis of ADHD needed further exploration and possible treatment. He was found to meet the ADHD

criteria, treatment could possibly assist his emotional reactivity and impulsivity.

He did not meet the criteria for conduct disorder.

(c) Mental Impairment:

The young person did not meet the criteria for mental impairment, given the writers did not believe there was sufficient evidence to indicate he had an intellectual disability. Furthermore, there was no evidence that he suffered a head injury.

The s 333 report recommended the following:

- (i) The young person had specific difficulties with communications and should undergo a communication assessment.
- (ii) Referral to be made to Taiohi Tu Taiohi Ora for further assessment and possible treatment of ADHD and to address emotional regulation skills including anger and low mood. If he was to be discharged, a referral would need to be made to the community provider.
- (iii) The young person should be referred to Altered High/CADS to address his substance abuse.
- (iv) The young person's family should be referred for Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST).
- (v) Given his difficulties with his learning, the young person will require support to engage in education.
- (vi) The young person would benefit from mentoring.

**Section 38 Criminal Procedure (Mentally Impaired Persons) Act 2003 (CP(MIP) Act) report dated 2 February 2018**

[9] A second report was obtained after the young person's Youth Advocate expressed concerns with the s 333 report on 15 December 2018. The CP(MIP) process was triggered and s 38 report directed to consider fitness to stand trial.

[10] Dr Karmyn Billing in her report dated 2 February 2018 found the young person is likely to be found fit to stand trial. She noted that he has verbal deficits in comprehension and processing speed, but described himself as being able to understand verbal information but being less able to express himself verbally. There are concerns about attention problems although it appeared he did not consistently present with problems in that area.

[11] Dr Billing came to the following conclusions:

(a) Intellectual Disability:

The young person did not meet the criteria for an intellectual disability as defined in s 7 of the IDCCR Act 2003.

(b) Mental Disorder:

The Young person did not meet the criteria of mental disorder under the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992.

(c) Mental Impairment:

Although the young person had deficits in verbal comprehension and processing speed, he did not meet the criteria for mental impairment.

**Section 38 Criminal Procedure (Mentally Impaired Persons) Act 2003 (CPMIP Act) report dated 4 June 2018 considering fitness to stand trial**

[12] On 23 April 2018 a third report was directed as to fitness to stand trial pursuant to s 38 of the CPMIP Act. In a report dated 6 June 2018 Dr Person found that the

young person would likely be found fit to stand trial. His personal weaknesses appear to be with verbal skills and slowed processing speed relative to age related peers. He sometimes required little more time to process and respond to oral questions but impressed as understanding Dr Person's questions.

[13] Dr Person made the following findings:

Mental Disorder:

- a. The young person does not currently meet the criteria for a mental disorder under the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992.
- b. He did not impress as having an abnormal state of mind characterised by delusions, or by disorders of mood or perception or volition or cognition to such a degree that it is a serious danger to the health/safety of himself/others, or seriously diminishes his self-care capacity.

Intellectual Disability

- c. The young person does not meet the diagnostic criteria for an Intellectual Disability as outlined in Section 7 of the IDDCR Act 2003 (Intellectual Disability Compulsory Care and Rehabilitation Act 2003).
- d. Although there are indications of development delay, his achievement was not considered as being significantly below by educational providers, his overall adaptive functioning (GAC) was in the Low range (no individual skills in the extremely low range), and his overall FSIQ was in the Borderline range (with scores suggesting varying abilities).

Fitness to stand trial

- e. In her opinion the young person would likely be found fit to stand trial.
- f. The young person's current personal weakness appear to be with verbal skills and slowed processing speed relative to age related peers. [AZ] sometimes required a little more time to process and respond to oral questions but impressed as understanding the author's questions. He demonstrated an appreciation of his charges and the seriousness of them. He impressed as having an adequate understanding of the nature, purpose, processes and consequences of Court proceedings, participants roles in Court, plea options, and the concepts such as admitting/denying. He impressed as understanding the substantial effect of evidence demonstrated logical thinking with his decision processes when he was considering his plea, and explained the core role of his Youth Advocate to help represent his rights. He demonstrated knowledge that he has a right to change any information that he disagrees with. Furthermore, it is seen from the previous

assessments that [AZ] appears to have improved his knowledge since first assessed last year (e.g, could more easily define Admit and Deny). This supports the RBANS results that the young person can learn information when he listens to auditory verbal information more than once (repeated presentations).

## **The Law**

[14] The police submit that due to the seriousness of this offending and the effect on the victim a conviction and transfer to the District Court for sentence pursuant to s 283(o) of the Act should be considered. The seriousness of the offending itself can be reason in and of itself to transfer a young person to the District Court for sentence *P v Police* [2017] NZHC 2445. If the young person is not convicted and transferred then in the police submission the only appropriate response in the Youth Court would be a supervision with residence order for six months, followed by a supervision order for 12 months (with a condition which includes mentoring or alternatively a mentoring order imposed concurrent with the supervision orders.

[15] On behalf of the young person it is submitted that although the offending is very serious it can adequately be addressed in the Youth Court jurisdiction.

[16] Section 283(o) of the Act provides:

283 Hierarchy of Courts responses if charge against young person proved

Group 7 response

(o) exercise the powers conferred by one of the following subparagraphs:

(i) The Court may order that the young person be brought before a District Court for sentence or decision, and may enter a conviction before doing so: and the Sentencing Act 2002 applies accordingly if:

(A) The young person is of or over the age of 15 years; or

(B) The young person is of or over the age of 14 years and under the age of 15 years and the charge proved against him or her is a charge in respect of a category 4 offence or category 3 offence for which the maximum penalty available is or includes imprisonment for life or at least 14 years.



[17] Before a young person can be convicted and transferred to the District Court under s 283(o), the Court must:

- (a) Consider the needs to impose the least restrictive outcome; and
- (b) Be satisfied that, in imposing such sanction, any less restrictive outcome is clearly inadequate<sup>1</sup>.

### **Family Group Conference**

[18] A Family Group Conference as to disposition was held on 13 July 2018 but there was no agreement.

### **Social Worker's Report and Plan**

[19] I have considered the Social Worker's report and plan dated 14 August 2018 and an updated plan taking into account the recommendations in the s 333 reports dated 4 December 2018. The recommendation of Oranga Tamariki is that the young person is made the subject of a six-month supervision with activity order pursuant to s 283(m) of the Oranga Tamariki Act (the Act), and to the young person to be judicially monitored. This would be followed by six-month supervision order pursuant to s 283(k) of the Act.

[20] Alternatively, Oranga Tamariki recommends a six-month supervision with residence order pursuant to ss 283(n) and 311 of the Act to be followed by a six-month supervision order.

[21] If not subject to a supervision with residence order, the young person would remain living at his grandparents [address deleted], the same address he is currently bailed to, in the care of his mother on a daily 7:00 pm to 7:00 am curfew and with a condition not to possess or consume alcohol. He would be engaged with Bluelight Programme from Monday to Friday for the duration of the supervision activity order and the supervision orders. The supervision activity order would also require him to

---

<sup>1</sup> Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 s 289(1)(b).

participate in a drug and alcohol programme with [service deleted] and anger management and a family relationship programme both through the [Trust deleted].

[22] If a supervision with residence order was made the young person would attend [school deleted], undergo an emotional regulation programme with Taiohi Tu Taiohi Ora and a full week dialectal behavioural therapy programme delivered by TTTO. There would be drug and alcohol support provided by Odyssey House including a comprehensive assessment and individual intervention plan and vocational, cultural and additional supports.

### **Social Worker's views**

[23] The young person has not reoffended and has only breached his bail condition once in relation to his curfew.

[24] The young person's current interim plan mirrors the Supervision Activity order and Supervision order. The Social Worker is of the view that the services and programmes are working well for the young person and addressing some of the underlying issues. The Social Worker is confident that during his time on the agreed interim plan the young person has continued to move forward and he will continue to progress with the help of the current supports.

[25] The Orders that are being proposed by the Social Worker support the s 333 recommendations.

[26] The young person is a 16 year old male of Tongan descent. He has spent seven months on remand in Korowai Manaaki. He had adapted and participated in structured activities, received one-on-one mentoring, engaged in recreational activities and support through his anger management and health needs. On 2 May 2018 he was bailed home and he has completed Supported Bail programme over seven weeks.

[27] On 25 October 2018 the young person graduated from the Reconnect Korowai Programme after eighteen weeks. The Korowai Link Youth mentor stated that throughout the programme she had no concerns with the young person. She commended his good engagement and support from his family, especially from his

mother. He was encouraged to stay positive and continue his good progress with the Bluelight programme.

[28] The young person is currently engaged in a very positive manner with the Bluelight programme, willingly attending the programme each day, compliant and always ready to be picked up. He has participated well and completed all tasks set for him. Bluelight Team Leader [TL] stated he is really impressed with the young person, who has demonstrated a willingness to work, follow instructions and has a good attitude. The young person's goals are to get into the construction and building industry or the Army. Bluelight are exploring NZMA building course for him. To date he has obtained a birth certificate, an IRD number, student ID number, bank account, library card and dental check.

[29] The young person's mother is very supportive of her son and appreciates the support from Bluelight programme. His mother says he was doing well at home following instructions and even going the extra mile to make her breakfast and coffee in the morning while he waited for pickup.

[30] For the past seven months the young person has been proactively engaging with programmes in the community and has not come to the attention of the police nor has he re-offended. The Social Worker believes that the young person will continue to be empowered and will make positive choices with the support of the services in the community provided for in the Youth Court jurisdiction.

### **Police Youth Aid**

[31] On 23 November 2018, Police Youth Aid [Constable 1] commended the young person and his mother for their efforts since being home on strict bail conditions, completed the supported bail programme, graduating from Reconnect Korowai programme and was continuing with Bluelight programme while awaiting his sentence.

[32] [Constable 1] said that he had always maintained good communication and engagement with the young person and his family and he had only breached his curfew once since being bailed at home.

### **The Young Person's views**

[33] On 22 November 2018 the young person stated that he was happy being home with the family especially when helping his grandparents. He wanted to be on the Bluelight programme full time so he can apply to be on the building or construction course.

[34] He enjoyed the daily activities from Reconnect Korowai Link and the Bluelight programme and the one-on-one mentoring. He believes with such support he can continue to make positive changes in his life. The young person wishes to apologise to the victim and his family for his actions.

### **Whanau Views**

[35] On 22 November 2018 the young person's mother said that she is proud of his progress since being bailed at home. She also praised the support from all services involved, the Korowai Manaaki staff, Reconnect Supported Bail Youth mentor, [Constable 1], Reconnect Korowai programme mentor, Mrs Story and the current Bluelight programme Youth mentor, [TL].

[36] The following principles of the Act are also relevant to a transfer decision:

- (a) The need to ensure that the young person is held accountable and encouraged to accepted responsibility, or his or her behaviour.
- (b) The need to consider the interests of any victims<sup>2</sup>.

[37] The factors to be taken into account on sentencing are:

#### **284 Factors to be taken into account on sentencing**

- (1) In deciding whether to make any order under section 283 of this Act in respect of any young person, the Court shall have regard to the following matters:
  - (a) the nature and circumstances of the offence proved to have been committed by the young person and the young person's involvement in that offence:

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 208(g).

- (b) the personal history, social circumstances, and personal characteristics of the young person, so far as those matters are relevant to the offence and any order that the Court is empowered to make in respect of it:
  - (c) the attitude of the young person towards the offence:
  - (d) the response of the young person's family, whanau, or family group to—
    - (i) the offending by that young person; and
    - (ii) the young person [themselves] as a result of that offending:
  - (e) any measures taken or proposed to be taken by the young person, or the family, whanau, or family group of the young person, to make reparation or apologise to any victim of the offending:
  - (f) the effect of the offence on any victim of the offence, and the need for reparation to be made to that victim:
  - (g) any previous offence proved to have been committed by the young person (not being an offence in respect of which an order has been made under section 282 of this Act or section 35 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1974), any penalty imposed or order made in relation to that offence, and the effect on the young person of the penalty or order:
  - (h) any decision, recommendation, or plan made or formulated by a family group conference.
  - [(i) the causes underlying the young person's offending, and the measures available for addressing those causes, so far as it is practicable to do so.]
- (2) The Court shall not make an order under any of paragraphs (k) to (o) of section 283 of this Act merely because the Court considers that the young person is in need of care or protection (as defined in section 14 of this Act).

[38] The Court of Appeal in *R v P* CA 59/03 states that the purpose of transfer is to “make available a wider and more punitive range of sanctions in those that a Youth Court could impose.”

[39] The Court of Appeal has also recognised that the seriousness of the offending may be a reason by itself to transfer charges from the Youth Court to the District Court. In *Pouwhare v R* [2010] NZCA 268 it observed:

As s 283(o) recognises, the orders that are within [the Youth Court's] powers to make will not always serve. Some young persons will always have to be sentenced in a court of general criminal jurisdiction. Their offences may be too serious for the youth justice regime to cater for.

[40] Subsequently, in *P v Police Downs J* commented at [32]:

Potential sentence is therefore clearly relevant to whether the offending is too serious to be dealt with in the Youth Court and may be decisive.

[41] The submissions made by the police were largely accepted by the youth person's Youth Advocate. I was referred to and considered a number of cases where young person was convicted and transferred to the District Court. In particular *P v Police* [2017] NZHC 2445, *R v [name deleted]* [2015] NZYC 27, *Police v [name deleted]* [2014] NZYC 985, *Police v [name deleted]* [2014] NZYC 242, *R v [name deleted]* [2014] NZYC 348.

[42] I was also referred to and considered the following cases where the young person was retained in the Youth Court jurisdiction: *Police v [name deleted]* [2015] NZYC 459 and *Police v [name deleted]* [2016] NZYC 369.

[43] In determining whether or not to convict and transfer the young person to the District Court for sentence pursuant to s 283(o) of the Act, the Youth Court principles set out in s 208 of Act are relevant. Having regard to *Police v SD* [2018] NZYC 169 (12 March 2018), I take into account Article 37(b) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: detention or imprisonment shall be used only as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time and Rule 19 of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, otherwise known as "The Beijing Rules":

The placement of a juvenile in an institution shall always be a disposition of last resort and for the minimum necessary period.

[44] I accept the submissions of both counsel that there are a number of conclusions that are able to be drawn from these cases and policy considerations:

- (a) Age and time available in the Youth Court jurisdiction for intervention is highly relevant. There is a presumption against transfer.

- (b) The seriousness of the offending and the likely term of imprisonment in the District Court is highly relevant, but not determinative.
- (c) In most cases where a transfer to the District Court was ordered, the young person had re-offended while already subject to a Group 6 order for a similar serious offence.
- (d) The Youth Court provides greater prospects of reducing the risk of further offending than the District Court. This is an important public consideration.

[45] The issue in this case is whether the interventions proposed by Oranga Tamariki would be clearly inadequate taking into account the need to hold the young person accountable for his serious offending, and to ensure the public interest is appropriately met.

[46] The following factors are relevant for the assessment of whether a s 283(o) order is appropriate in this case:

(a) *Nature of circumstances of the offending*

It is accepted that the primary factor that weighs in favour of transfer in this particular case is the serious nature of the young person's offending which was an unprovoked attack on a bus driver in the course of his employment. The young person slashed the bus driver's throat and stabbed him twice in the body. As a result, the victim sustained serious injuries. The random, gratuitous nature of the offending gives rise to significant concern and raises public protection considerations.

There is no issue that on application of the band in *Tauaki v R*, the offending would fall into the top of Band two, warranting a starting point of five to ten years imprisonment, taking into account the aggravating features of the use of a weapon, the extreme, unprovoked violence and the high risk attack to the victim's neck, a very vulnerable part of the body.

An uplift is required to reflect the use of violence the aggravated robbery and a starting point of up to ten years imprisonment is likely to be adopted in the District Court.

*(b) Personal circumstances of the offender*

The s 333 reports, subsequent s 38 reports and the s 334 report prepared for disposition are very relevant to the young person's personal circumstances. He is one of [multiple] children. His family has a long care and protection history and he has experienced violence and trauma in his upbringing. Gangs are a factor and there is no positive role model in his life.

He has not attended school since September 2017. Once in Korowai Manaaki he attended school but does not wish to return to study. He wishes to work in the construction industry.

The young person has recently been diagnosed with ADHD and is receiving treatment. He is assessed in the first fitness report as having a full scale IQ of 73 falling into the very low range of intellectual functioning. He is a susceptible and vulnerable person.

*(c) Attitude of the young person to the office*

In the s 334 report, the young person said he had been drinking and smoking weed and that he had an argument with his sister. He describes himself as being in a state of "rage". In the s 333 disposition report, however, he says he was not angry when he got onto the bus but only became incensed after the bus driver tried to kick him off. He has expressed his remorse for what he did to the bus driver and his family and he knows what he did was wrong. He wished to write an apology letter to the victim with the help of Talking Trouble.

In the disposition report, the young person again repeats he is sorry for his actions but that he did not usually feel sorry after an altercation. The report writer noted that it appeared to be difficult for him to talk about his offending.



*(d) Response of the whanau to the young person*

The Social Workers reports state that his whanau are shocked and disappointed and sympathise for the victim. The young person is supported by his mother and his Aunt who have been involved throughout this proceeding. The family wish these matters be dealt with in the Youth Court and they remain supportive of him.

*(e) Any measures taken by the whanau to apologise or make reparation to the victim*

The whanau offered to make reparation by way of a mea ofa ki he mamahi. His family wish to formally apologise to the victim and his family. There is also the proposal that the young person would write a letter of apology through Talking Trouble to the victim.

The police are not aware of any steps taken to date in that regard.

*(f) Effect on the victim*

The updated victim impact report dated 26 October 2018 confirms the very serious and continuing effects of this attack on the victim.

*(g) Previous offences committed by the young person and orders imposed*

The young person has not previously been the subject of any Youth Court orders.

*(h) FGC recommendations*

The FGC resulted in a non-agreement.

*(i) Underlying causes of the offending and measures available to address those*

The young person is assessed as posing a high risk of reoffending and a high risk of violence. His risk of violence is relatively indiscriminate (strangers, rivals and family members are risk scenarios) and is increased when he is intoxicated.

The report and plan propose the following interventions:

#### Anger management/managing interpersonal conflict

The young person's anger is a significant identified issue. The proposed six-month Supervision with Activity order would include anger management, counselling through the [Trust] and Bluelight. This would be followed by six-month supervision order with counselling again available through Bluelight.

The alternative is six-month Supervision with Residence including emotional regulation provided by TTTO and group DBT. That would be followed by the same six-month supervision programme with support from Bluelight.

#### Substance abuse

Alcohol is a real trigger to his violent offending and he also has drug issues.

### **Conclusion**

[47] The young person is a first offender who has not sought to excuse his offending and his remorse is genuine. His childhood has been one of grief, frustration and trauma. Since this offending he has had an excellent response to assistance and rehabilitation. He was in Korowai Manaaki for seven months and then released on strict bail regimes of varying degrees some eight months ago. His response to the three programmes that he has attended over the past eight months has been excellent and he has not reoffended. The disposition report writer identified a number of risk factors that need to be addressed to reduce his level of risk. The long term programmes, treatment and counselling proposed would hold the young person accountable for his offending and ensure the public interest is appropriately met.

[48] Taking all matters into account, including his age and the time for which Youth Court orders could remain effective and the fact he has not been subject to any formal Youth Court orders previously, I am satisfied that the purposes and principles of the Act can be met by a supervision with residence order for 6 months followed by a supervision order and judicial monitoring.

[49] On each of the charges which have been proved in the Youth Court, there will therefore be a Supervision with Residence order imposed for six months based on the plan prepared by the Social Worker, to be followed by Supervision order for twelve months. The imposition of the Supervision order component is deferred until the early release date.

J H Lovell-Smith  
Youth Court Judge