



Sabrina's story

Disclaimer: *This is the story of a person who shared their personal experience with the Commission of Inquiry through a submission or interview. The names in this story are pseudonyms and identifying details have been removed. The person who shared this experience may not have been a witness and their account is not evidence. They did not take an oath or affirmation before providing the story.*

Nothing in this story constitutes a finding of fact by the Commission of Inquiry. Instead, these stories have been published to show how people are experiencing the current child safety system in Queensland. Any views expressed are those of the person who shared their experience, not of the Commission of Inquiry.

Content warning: *Some material may be distressing. These statements may include references to violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation, suicide, or self-harming behaviours, and may contain strong or confronting language. Some narratives may be about First Nations people who have passed away. Readers are encouraged to engage with this material in a way that supports their wellbeing.*

If you would like support, please visit the Commission's Contact & Support page or reach out to a trusted person or a relevant support service.

To the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry,

I write to formally lodge this submission and to request instructions for the secure transmission of extensive affidavit material and supporting exhibits. The files are substantial in size and contain sworn affidavits from both the Department and myself, together with documentary evidence referenced throughout this correspondence. All evidentiary material relied upon is contained within those submissions.

This matter raises serious concerns regarding residential care oversight, evidentiary integrity in risk assessment, treatment of domestic violence victims within child protection frameworks, and accuracy in ministerial reporting.

1. Residential Care Oversight and Disclosed Harm

My children were removed on the asserted basis of protection from anticipated "risk of harm." At the time of removal, they were healthy, emotionally secure, bonded to me, attending school, medically attended, and developmentally on track. There was no substantiated evidence of physical injury, environmental neglect, or emotional harm attributable to my care.

Within the first week of residential placement, my children disclosed physical abuse. During subsequent contact, they presented with observable indicators consistent with neglect. Those indicators are detailed and evidenced within my filed material.

Child Safety Commission of Inquiry



While there is no current active harm, the prior disclosures and visible presentation in care warrant independent examination. The absence of present danger does not negate the seriousness of what occurred following removal.

The State assumed guardianship on the premise of preventing anticipated harm. Where actual harm is then disclosed or observable in care, the response threshold must be immediate, rigorous, and transparent. The material demonstrates that the response did not reflect the urgency applied at the point of removal from me.

This raises systemic questions regarding supervision standards, reporting pathways, placement oversight, and internal accountability mechanisms within residential care settings.

2. Presumptive Risk Attribution Based on Substance Use

The Department's assessment in my case reflects a presumption that substance use, in and of itself, equates to parental incapacity. That presumption was applied despite the absence of demonstrable harm to my children in my care.

There was no substantiated finding that my children were abused, malnourished, unsafe, developmentally compromised, or emotionally destabilised while living with me. They were loved, stable, and appropriately provided for.

Risk assessment must be evidence-based and proportionate. A categorical equation of substance use with harm, absent proof of impact on the children, undermines procedural fairness and distorts protective thresholds.

3. Mischaracterisation of a Domestic Violence Victim

I am a documented victim of serious domestic violence. Rather than being engaged through a trauma-informed and protective lens, my victimisation was reframed as instability or parental risk.



Protective actions taken to escape violence were interpreted adversely. This inversion materially influenced risk assessment and contributed to an adverse narrative unsupported by balanced analysis.

The treatment of domestic violence victims within child protection processes requires systemic scrutiny to ensure that victim status is not mischaracterised as parental deficiency.

4. Refusal of Support During the Investigation Period

During the investigation phase, I repeatedly requested support services. Those requests were declined, delayed, or not meaningfully facilitated.

The Department cannot assert protective concerns while withholding the very supports designed to mitigate those concerns. Such an approach creates structural imbalance and compounds vulnerability rather than addressing it.

5. Reliance on Vexatious Family Law Material

Material originating from family law proceedings was relied upon despite being filed vexatiously and without leave of the relevant court. Allegations contained within that material were treated as probative without judicial determination or evidentiary testing.

This reliance contributed to narrative bias and procedural unfairness.

6. Misrepresentation of Complaint Outcomes to the Minister

Following my formal complaint, representations were made to the Minister indicating that the matter had been



resolved or appropriately addressed.

The documentary record contained within my submissions does not support that conclusion. The substance of my complaint — including allegations of harm in care — was not comprehensively investigated nor remedied. There is a material discrepancy between internal reality and external reporting.

Transparency in ministerial communication is fundamental to public accountability.

7. Procedural Fairness and Evidentiary Integrity

Across the proceedings, there was:

- Selective reliance on contested allegations;
- Incomplete contextual presentation of my statements;
- Disproportionate weighting of adverse material;
- Insufficient consideration of evidence demonstrating my children’s wellbeing in my care.

This submission is not framed as an emergency. There is no current active harm. However, the prior disclosures of abuse, observable indicators of neglect in care, and the systemic inconsistencies identified warrant independent scrutiny.

Request

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Accept the accompanying affidavit material for independent review;
- Examine residential care oversight mechanisms and response thresholds;
- Review the treatment of domestic violence victims within child protection risk assessments;
- Scrutinise evidentiary standards applied in removal decisions;
- Investigate representations made to the Minister regarding the handling and outcome of my complaint.