

Refusal to Receive a Reported Offence After Requiring One Kings Cross Police Area Command — 3 to 21 August 2025

Complainant	Anthony Lawrence Smith
Officer	Senior Constable Duncan Handley, Kings Cross Police Area Command
Requirement stated	3 August 2025, 5 August 2025, 8 August 2025
Offence reported	5 August 2025 (reported in writing 9 August 2025)
Refusal	21 August 2025
Nature of offence	Stalking and harassment via a carriage service
Related prosecution	H81615839, dismissed 10 June 2025
Forensic reference	Cybertrace Ref 2025-4663

1. Purpose of This Exhibit

This exhibit documents a closed loop. Over three emails in August 2025, a NSW Police officer told the complainant that police would act only on a new offence, not on matters already reported. The complainant then reported a new offence, dated, evidenced and framed to the officer's own stated test. The officer replied that he had not read it.

The exhibit does not depend on any contested fact, any pending GIPA request, or any assessment of the underlying evidence. Every finding rests on the officer's own words in a single email thread held by both parties. The conduct it establishes is procedural: a reporting requirement was set, met, and then not received.

2. The Requirement, Stated Three Times

Across three emails the officer set a consistent test. Old matters would not be actioned. A new offence was required.

3 August 2025

"If there is any evidence of a crime, specifically a fresh crime not already dealt with by the courts, then please, please, either make an online report via our website or come into a police station."

5 August 2025, 08:34

"If you have new matters to report, and if you are getting nowhere with QLD Police, you can always make an online report."

8 August 2025, 18:34

"If you have a new incident then you should be able to go directly to QLD Police and make a report, they will pass it to us, to evaluate and possibly start an investigation if it warrants it."

"In a nutshell I suggest dropping old matters, and only making a police report if a new crime occurs."

Source: email thread, "Re: Your correspondence — My History of Attempted Reporting via Online and Local Police Channels".

3. The Offence Occurred the Same Day the Requirement Was Set

On 5 August 2025, the day the officer wrote that new matters could be reported, two Instagram accounts followed the complainant's personal account. Both accounts were already identified in the Cybertrace forensic report as linked to the person the complainant had reported. One had previously sent him direct threats.

5 Aug 2025, 08:34	Officer states new matters can be reported.
5 Aug 2025	Two named Instagram accounts follow the complainant's personal account.
9 Aug 2025, 13:00	Complainant reports the incident in writing, citing the officer's own test.
21 Aug 2025, 15:04	Officer replies that he has not read it.

4. The Report That Met the Test

On 9 August 2025 the complainant reported the incident, opening by naming the test back to the officer:

"You asked me to bring forward a recent, clear crime where I am the personal victim. Accordingly, I am formally reporting a direct act of stalking and harassment that occurred on August 5, 2025."

The report was structured against the officer's criteria and evidenced in three parts:

- **Threatening engagement.** Attachment A: screenshots of prior messages from the same alias, including "your life is about to get a lot worse" and "you can't hide anymore".
- **Accounts linked to the person reported.** Attachment B: excerpts from the Cybertrace report establishing the forensic link between the aliases and that person.
- **A new, documented act.** Attachment C: screenshots of the follow requests from both accounts, dated 5 August 2025.

The complainant identified the offence as stalking and harassment via a carriage service and asked that an Event Number be issued. The incident post-dated the dismissal of H81615839 by under two months, so it could not have been dealt with by any court.

5. The Refusal

On 21 August 2025 the officer replied in full:

"Tony as discussed there is no such thing as a formal report via email. **I have not read this except the first sentence.** I am on leave for a month. If you have anything to report please either make an online report, or call or go into a police station."

The significance is not that the report was assessed and rejected. It is that it was not assessed. The officer states that he read one sentence. No Event Number was issued. No assessment of the material was made or recorded. The requirement he had set three times was met, and the response was a restatement of channel.

6. Every Channel Named Was Already Closed

The officer directed the complainant to online reporting, to Queensland Police, and to attendance at a police station. Each had already refused in writing, with reference numbers held by the complainant.

4 Oct 2024	ReportCyber advises the matter "does not fit ReportCyber guidelines" and that "this email will end correspondence with you in relation to this report".
2 Oct 2024	Crime Stoppers CIRS-20241002-79 not referred to local police, classified as a "Domestic Violence situation" outside ReportCyber guidelines.
21 Nov 2024	Crime Stoppers CIRS-20241121-242: QLD Police state it has "not been sent to QPS for investigation and may sit with NSW police as the offences are occurring there".
27 Nov 2024	Customer Assistance Unit states it is "unable to provide updates on existing events" and that stalking must be reported in person.
18 Dec 2024	ReportCyber CIRS-20241218-5 rejected on the same "Domestic Violence situation" basis.
28 Jan 2025	Crime Stoppers analyst advises all offences against the person must be reported in person; Redcliffe Station then advises it cannot book an appointment.
29 Jan 2025	Sergeant Jake Lacy, Redcliffe Station, formally confirms QLD Police cannot investigate matters occurring in NSW.

The complainant holds a documented PTSD diagnosis and a psychologist's report, provided to this command, addressing his inability to attend a police station or communicate by telephone. Written communication was therefore the only channel available to him, and it is the one channel the officer declined to accept.

7. What This Exhibit Establishes

- A reporting requirement was set by a serving officer, in writing, three times.
- An offence meeting that requirement occurred on the day it was set, and was reported within four days.

- The report was evidenced, dated, and linked to an existing forensic identification.
- The officer recorded in writing that he did not read it.
- No Event Number was issued and no assessment was recorded.
- Every alternative channel the officer named had already refused the complainant in writing.

The result is a reporting pathway with no open entry point. Each channel refers the complainant to another, and the officer setting the requirement declines to receive the answer to it. This is the mechanism by which the complainant's reports have gone unrecorded, and it is documented here entirely in the words of the officer who applied it.

Anthony Lawrence Smith | All correspondence by email only. No telephone contact.