



Forcibly Displaced  
People Network

**Submission to the ACT Government**  
**Hate crime and vilification review**  
**Focus on the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly**  
**displaced people**

30 March 2026 (extension granted)



## **Forcibly Displaced People Network**

Email: [admin@fdpn.org.au](mailto:admin@fdpn.org.au)

Website: [www.fdpn.org.au](http://www.fdpn.org.au)

### **Acknowledgements:**

We thank LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people who have shared their lived experiences and expertise with us to inform the contents of this submission.

### **Suggested citation:**

Dixson, R. (2026) Submission to the ACT Government's Hate Crime and Vilification Review. *Focus on the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people*. Canberra, Australia: Forcibly Displaced People Network.

### **Copyright: CC-BY-NC-NC**

(c) 2026 Forcibly Displaced People Network Ltd

## Contents

About the Forcibly Displaced People Network .....	4
Note on the used terminology .....	4
Full list of recommendations .....	4
Introduction .....	6
About the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in Australia .....	6
Prevalence of discrimination against LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people .....	6
Experiences of violence against LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people .....	7
Responses to the consultation questions.....	8
Question 1: Protected attributes under section 67A(1) of the <i>Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)</i> .....	8
Question 6: Protected attributes under section 750 of the <i>Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)</i> .....	8
Question 4: Barriers to making a complaint about unlawful vilification to the ACT Human Rights Commission.....	9
Case study 1 .....	10
Case study 2.....	11
Question 7: Formulation of the serious vilification offence .....	11
Question 14: Desirability for introducing an aggravated offence for hate motivated actions and explicit consideration of the offender's motivations in sentencing.....	12
Aggravated offences .....	12
Sentencing considerations as per section 33 of the <i>Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)</i> .....	12
Question 15: Consideration of the new offences to be introduced to protect against hate crimes.....	13
Question 16: Other legal changes to enable successful prosecution of a standalone hate crime offense.....	14
Question 17: Barriers to reporting hate crimes to police.....	14
Question 18: Availability of support services.....	15
Case study 3.....	15
Question 19: Other suggestions for the prevention of hate crime .....	16

## About the Forcibly Displaced People Network

The Forcibly Displaced People Network (FDPN) is Australia's first national LGBTIQ+ refugee-led organisation and a peak body working to address LGBTIQ+ displacement. FDPN's work combines advocacy, research, and capacity-building to ensure that policy development and service delivery reflect and meet the needs of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people. For more information visit <http://fdpn.org.au/>.

### Note on the used terminology

We use the term **'forcibly displaced'** to recognise the diverse and complex experiences of LGBTIQ+ people who have been compelled or coerced to leave their countries of origin. This includes LGBTIQ+ people:

- who are currently seeking asylum (including people on a range of bridging visas (including those awaiting deportation) and international students who have applied for a protection visa but have remained on a student visa);
- recognised refugees (including those with permanent residency either having been resettled through an offshore humanitarian program and those who have received an onshore protection visa, and those with a temporary protection visa); and
- migrants (particularly those from outside the Global North).

The term is broader than legal categories because many LGBTIQ+ people experience different forms of coercion, pressure, or lack of safety that influence their decision to relocate to Australia, even when they arrive through a visa pathway.

Where we use 'women', we refer to cisgender and transgender women and girls, as well as non-binary and gender-diverse people with lived experience of misogyny or sexism.

## Full list of recommendations

### For the ACT Government:

- Amend section 67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* to include immigration status, nationality, and national or ethnic origin as protected characteristics from unlawful vilification.
- Amend section 370 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)* to include immigration status, nationality, and national or ethnic origin as protected characteristics from serious vilification.
- Invest in targeted community education about unlawful vilification, ensuring that such education is delivered in an intersectional way, translated into multiple community languages and is accessible.
- Amend the definition of aggravated offence under the *Crimes Act 1900 (ACT)* to include the motivation of hate and prejudice against protected groups and those associated with protected groups.

- Investigate whether section 3(d) of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* is being applied as intended in considering the sentencing for relevant crimes.
- Amend section 3 of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* to include a requirement to consider whether a crime was motivated by hate and/or prejudice in sentencing.
- Investigate whether the definition of a 'vulnerable person' under section 33(1)(gb) of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* captures all intended circumstances.
- Ensure that judicial decision makers and legal practitioners are required to undertake training and education on considering hate motivation in sentencing, and anti-racism training.
- Introduce a standalone hate crime offence.
- Require the ACT Policing to reinstate the LGBTIQ+ Liaison Officer role.
- Fund an establishment of a dedicated community legal service (or a dedicated service offering within a current community legal service) to deliver integrated support through a holistic lawyer and social worker model for LGBTIQ+ people victims of vilification and hate crimes.
- Fund justice system peer-navigators who can provide one-to-one support across dealing with police, the Human Rights Commission, ACAT, and the criminal justice system.
- Fund awareness-raising campaigns on the human rights of LGBTIQ+ people, delivered in intersectional ways.
- Fund awareness-raising and prevention campaigns to increase understanding of the legal protections available in vilification and hate crimes cases.

**For ACT Policing:**

- Reinstate the LGBTIQ+ Liaison Officer role, and require the LLO to meaningfully engage with LGBTIQ+ communities to build trust.
- Undertakes proactive and sustained outreach with LGBTIQ+ communities including those who are forcibly displaced people.
- Mandates the training for all staff on working with LGBTIQ+ communities, including specifically with LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people.

## Introduction

We thank the ACT Government for the opportunity to make a submission to the Hate Crime and Vilification Review. Our submission focuses on the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people. It is structured as follows:

- We first include some introductory remarks about the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people.
- We then provide responses to the consultation questions 1, 4, 6, 7, 14-19.

Where case studies have been included, names, countries of origin and other identifying details have been changed for privacy and safety reasons. All other details reflect real lived experiences.

### About the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in Australia

The experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in Australia are multifaceted and are often marked by ongoing settlement challenges, including violence, discrimination and social exclusion. In many cases, LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people find themselves excluded from both their ethnic communities and LGBTIQ+ communities. These challenges are intensified by pre-migration experiences of violence and trauma, the breakdown of social and family networks, and distrust of authorities, particularly where authorities were themselves a source of violence or criminalisation. Some people do not have clear knowledge of how Australian legal and justice systems operate. Others are concerned that reporting harmful experiences may lead to visa cancellation or other negative migration outcomes.

It is critical to note that FDPN does not suggest that all LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people have less knowledge or less capacity. Rather, this submission applies an intersectional lens to show how race, LGBTIQ+ status, migration status and disability can combine to produce inequitable outcomes and barriers to justice.

### Prevalence of discrimination against LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people

In 2022, FDPN produced *Inhabiting Two Worlds At Once*<sup>1</sup>, the first comprehensive Australia-wide report on the experiences of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in Australia. The report found high rates of discrimination and violence and identified persistent inequities across multiple areas of settlement.

We note that the survey did not distinguish between discrimination and unlawful vilification. In some parts, we sought to examine discrimination in specific settings (e.g. healthcare and education), while in other parts we asked broader questions about discrimination outside defined settings. These findings remain highly relevant to this review because they show patterns of harm and the ways those experiences shape service access, complaint-making and justice-seeking.

The report found that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Cochrane, B., et al. (2023) "Inhabiting Two Worlds At Once": Survey on the experiences of LGBTIQ+ settlement in Australia. Canberra, Australia: Forcibly Displaced People Network. Available online: <https://www.fdpn.org.au/lgbtiqa-settlement-report/>

- 69% of respondents experienced LGBTIQ+ discrimination
- 85% of respondents experienced racism and discrimination linked to migration status, and
- 15 % of respondents reported ableism.

The report also found that 56% of respondents said ongoing experiences of discrimination had an ongoing negative impact on their physical and mental health.

The report also identified a common pattern of non-reporting. Participants often did not make complaints because they did not think the situation would be resolved, did not know they could seek remedies, feared repercussions, feared visa cancellation, or blamed themselves for the discrimination. Those who did make complaints often reported that nothing changed, or that they were ostracised or dismissed afterwards.

Most importantly, these experiences were often not based on a single attribute. Respondents commonly described discrimination linked to a combination of factors, including sexuality, gender identity, race, migration status and disability. This is central to FDPN’s analysis. The issue is not only that discrimination occurs, but that it often occurs in overlapping ways that are not well addressed by systems built around a single-axis understanding of harm.

### Experiences of violence against LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people

FDPN’s report also found that 60% of participants who answered the question had experienced at least one form of violence in Australia. The table below shows the responses based on the most commonly reported forms of violence disaggregated by the types of perpetrators.

Type of violence	Reported perpetrators				
	Intimate partner	Family members	Stranger	Another known person <sup>2</sup>	Authority figure <sup>3</sup>
Emotional abuse (n=21)	8	2	2	8	1
Physical violence (n=20)	5	2	10	3	0
Verbal abuse (n=20)	3	2	8	7	0
Sexual harassment (n=19)	3	1	4	10	1
LGBTIQ+ related abuse (n=9)	0	1	4	4	0
Property damage (n=9)	5	0	3	1	0

<sup>2</sup> Another known person refers to housemates, co-workers or students in the same class or educational institution.

<sup>3</sup> Authority figure refers to police, other government officials or community services workers.

Sexual violence (n=9)	3	1	3	2	0
Technology-facilitated abuse (n=8)	1	0	4	3	0

The findings that most common perpetrators of physical violence, verbal abuse, LGBTIQ+ related abuse and technology-facilitated abuse were strangers, and that other known persons were also likely to inflict emotional, verbal and LGBTIQ+ related abuse are significant and relevant in the context of this review.

It is both noteworthy and deeply concerning that of the participants who said they had experienced violence in Australia, only about 17% said they had attempted to seek services afterwards. Participants were most likely to seek support from counsellors or friends. This suggests substantial barriers to engaging formal systems. Some participants reported poor communication from police, fear of police based on experiences in Australia and overseas, and systems' failure to be taken seriously.

These findings are directly relevant to this review. They show that hate, vilification and violence must be understood within the broader lived realities of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people. The barriers are not only legal. They are also social, cultural, structural and migration-related. Any effective legal and policy response must recognise that full context.

## Responses to the consultation questions

### Question 1: Protected attributes under section 67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)*

and

### Question 6: Protected attributes under section 750 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)*

While FDPN supports the current lists of protected attributes under section 67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* and section 370 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)*, we do not consider both lists to be fully sufficient. We recommend expanding the lists in both Acts by adding:

- immigration status;
- nationality; and
- national or ethnic origin.

The *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* already recognises immigration status as a protected attribute under section 7(i). Expanding the list of protected attributes under s67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* and section 370 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)* to include immigration status enables its direct applications to people on a range of visas

offering them protections from unlawful vilification and serious vilification on these grounds.

The current gap across both Acts matters in practice. Anti-refugee and anti-migrant hostility often targets people not only because of their race or religion, but because of their migration status. The hateful rhetoric is often designed to undermine social cohesion and presents those who are non-citizens, not only as people who do not belong but also as those threatening the 'security of borders'. That hostility is often explicit in online abuse, public commentary and harassment in education, housing and services. While these harmful narratives are racist at the core, expanding the list of protected attributes offers not only protection but symbolic recognition of their full humanity and human rights. For LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people, these forms of hostility often overlap with homophobia, transphobia and racism. The surge in the far-right demonstrations across Australia, where calls to violence are often made specifically in relation to forcibly displaced people, also substantiates the need for these amendments to the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)*.

The addition of nationality and national or ethnic origin is also critical. While 'race' is included both under sections 7 and 67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* and section 370 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)*, specific mentions are important as often the hatred and vilification when directed at forcibly displaced people, it is directed at those of particular ethnic origins. These protected attributes already exist in the Commonwealth legislation.

## Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

1. Amend section 67A(1) of the *Discrimination Act 1991 (ACT)* to include immigration status, nationality, and national or ethnic origin as protected characteristics from unlawful vilification.
2. Amend section 370 of the *Criminal Code 2002 (ACT)* to include immigration status, nationality, and national or ethnic origin as protected characteristics from serious vilification.
  - a. If the protected attribute of 'race' is applied by the current law to capture nationality, and national or ethnic origin, create additional guidance in the Acts, its explanatory materials and Statute book about such an interpretation.

## Question 4: Barriers to making a complaint about unlawful vilification to the ACT Human Rights Commission

Based on our support of LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in the ACT and across other jurisdictions, we believe that the barriers to making complaints about unlawful vilification to the ACT Human Rights Commission (HRC) are significant. For people who are

systemically marginalised such as LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people, complaint-making can feel risky and exhausting.

For LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people these barriers include the following:

- Limited understanding of the differences between discrimination and unlawful vilification, and that civil protections are available;
- Low awareness that online conduct may amount to unlawful vilification and can be reported through a civil complaints pathway;
- Fear of repercussions for making a complaint, including a fear of visa cancellation or deportation;
- Distrust in authorities, and that they will help.

These barriers are also highlighted by the lack of tailored legal assistance to navigate these processes. It is also common that organisations funded to provide supports to forcibly displaced people are either not funded to support them with information and support to address unlawful vilification, or in general do not have relevant skills to specifically support LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, specialist and community-controlled organisations such as FDPN are not funded by the government.

There is also another consideration, worthy of noting, that is an interaction between the civil protections for vilification online with the commonwealth e-safety laws and the obligation of social media platforms to remove harmful content. While many people understand platform reporting tools, they do not understand that removal of content by a platform may not address accountability, harm or repeat conduct. Consider the following case studies.

### Case study 1

Aysha, a trans refugee woman from Indonesia, made a public post saying she would be joining an FDPN's Mardi Gras float calling other LGBTIQ+ refugees from Indonesia to express interest. A person from her university responded with public comments that were racist, transphobic and anti-refugee in their nature. The comments called for borders to be closed, for refugees to be sent back, and used religious references to condemn her gender identity. Aysha reported the comments to the platform. The comments were removed and she blocked the user.

This case study demonstrates that Aysha did not know that the conduct may also have been unlawful vilification and that she could have made a complaint to HRC. Additionally, it could have been possible to also refer the matter to ACAT and seek an order to prevent the person from repeating such vilification.

---

<sup>4</sup> Australian Coalition for LGBTIQ+ Asylum and Migration Justice. (2025) Roadmap for Action: Achieving asylum and migration justice for LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people. available at: <https://www.fdpn.org.au/roadmap-for-action/>

## Case study 2

Nishin, a member of the FDPN's lived advisory group, made a public call-out on his Facebook page, seeking contact from community members to support policy work, which he was tasked with leading. He then received comments from multiple anonymous accounts calling for refugees to be removed from Australia. Although he understood that some legal pathways existed, he was unsure what could be done where account holders used aliases and object images instead of personal photographs. He reported the content to the platform but did not pursue any further action.

Both case studies demonstrate the need for targeted community education about unlawful vilification, and also urge the government's consideration of the interaction with existing commonwealth frameworks, particularly in the context of social media.

## Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

3. Invest in targeted community education about unlawful vilification, ensuring that such education is delivered in an intersectional way, translated in multiple community languages and is accessible.
  - a. This work should be delivered in partnership with community organisations that already support LGBTIQ+ people, refugees and migrants.

## Question 7: Formulation of the serious vilification offence

The discussion paper that "given the requirements for a common assault prosecution are lower than the requirements for a serious vilification prosecution, there may be a structural incentive to prosecute the common assault." While commenting on the formulation of the offence is beyond the scope of our expertise, within the context of the lack of police training, as discussed further in this submission, we have serious concerns that the complexity of providing additional elements may be pushing police and prosecutors toward more familiar offences, including common assault, threats or property offences, denying victims of crime full justice. We are particularly concerned about the possible decisions towards prosecuting the serious vilification as common assault in contexts where serious vilification had defined gendered elements, such as calling for sexual violence against women and gender-diverse people or calling for acts of violence, that would have been found as sexuality and gender identity practices under the Sexuality and Gender Identity Conversion Practices Act 2020 (ACT). A combined approach of considering improving clarity in relation to each element of the offence (however formulated) and police education and training in relation to the offence and prosecution are required to ensure the offence and its prosecution provide protection for serious vilification under the criminal law.

## Question 14: Desirability for introducing an aggravated offence for hate motivated actions and explicit consideration of the offender's motivations in sentencing

### Aggravated offences

FDPN does not consider that the current definition of an aggravated offence under section 9A of the *Crimes Act 1900 (ACT)*, which only includes offences in the context of family violence and offences against pregnant people, to be sufficient. We strongly support the introduction of aggravated offences for hate-motivated conduct, in alignment with our recommendation to expand the list of protected attributes. This would allow the hate element to be recognised in the charge itself rather than only at sentencing.

The attacks on gay and bisexual men through the dating app Grindr serve as an example to this recommendation. These attacks, while resulting in physical and bodily harm and property damage, were clearly motivated by hate against LGBTIQ+ communities. This is because alleged perpetrators specifically used Grindr pretending to be a young man, as opposed to using for example Tinder app and pretending to be young women. Yet within the current ACT legislation, addressing hate motivation for the offence is not possible.

### Sentencing considerations as per section 33 of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)*

The attacks via Grindr are also an example that while the law could be seen as offering protections to victims, its practical application, in particular by police could be improved. Section 3(d) requires to consider if personal circumstances of the victim were known to the offender. We have concerns regarding its application, given the lack of reporting in the ACT about any convictions in the 'Grindr attacks'.

Section 33(1)(gb) requires to consider if a victim of crime was a vulnerable person, defined as follows:

vulnerable person means an adult who—

(a) has a disability within the meaning of the *Disability Services Act 1991*; or

(b) is at least 60 years old and—

(i) has a disorder, illness or disease that affects the person's thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or otherwise results in disturbed behaviour; or

(ii) has an impairment that—

(A) is intellectual, psychiatric, sensory or physical in nature; and

(B) results in a substantially reduced capacity of the person for communication, learning or mobility; or

(iii) for any other reason is socially isolated or unable to participate in the life of the person's community.

We argue that an LGBTIQ+ person seeking asylum as a person whose migration status is temporary could be considered to be a vulnerable person given their migration precarity. There is also much evidence demonstrating that mental health outcomes for LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people are significantly worse not only in comparison with the broader population but also with refugee and LGBTIQ+ populations. While we do not seek to equate one's displacement with default vulnerability, we recommend that the ACT Government considers whether amendments to the definition of a vulnerable person are required. We also lack clarity, whether mental health conditions are captured within the definition of disability in the *Disability Services Act 1991 (ACT)*.

Section 33(m) requires the consideration of "the cultural background, character, antecedents, age and physical or mental condition of the offender". Within the high prevalence of racism in Australia, there is well-established evidence of overcriminalisation and overincarceration of offenders who are people of colour vs those from Anglo-Celtic backgrounds. It is thus critical that judicial decision makers are required to undertake anti-racism training.

### Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

4. Amend the definition of aggravated offence under the *Crimes Act 1900 (ACT)* to include the motivation of hate and prejudice against protected groups and those associated with protected groups.
5. Investigate whether section 3(d) of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* is being applied as intended in considering the sentencing for relevant crimes.
6. Amend section 3 of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* to include a requirement to consider whether a crime was motivation by hate and/or prejudice in sentencing.
7. Investigate whether the definition of a 'vulnerable person' under section 33 (1)(gb) of the *Crimes (Sentencing) Act 2005 (ACT)* captures all intended circumstances.
8. Ensure that judicial decision makers and legal practitioners are required to undertake training and education on considering hate motivation in sentencing, and anti-racism training.

### Question 15: Consideration of the new offences to be introduced to protect against hate crimes

FDPN supports an introduction of a standalone hate crime offence. This offence should sit alongside serious vilification, not replace it. It should apply to violent acts, attempts, and serious threats where the conduct is motivated wholly or partly by hostility, hatred or prejudice toward a protected group and those associated with a protected group.

A standalone hate crime offence would do more than increase punishment. It would provide legal recognition that hate-based violence causes a distinct form of harm. For LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people, that point is critical. Many have already been subjected to persecution, assault or threats in their countries of origin on the basis of their sexuality, gender identity, sex characteristics, race or religion. When similar conduct happens again in Australia, it does not feel like an isolated incident. It reinforces displacement, erodes safety and tells the person that exclusion has followed them here.

## Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

9. Introduce a standalone hate crime offence.

### Question 16: Other legal changes to enable successful prosecution of a standalone hate crime offense

If police and prosecutors continue to rely on other offences, the system should still be required to identify and record the hate-based element. Police should record bias indicators at the first point of contact. If prejudice motivation is raised and not pursued, reasons should be documented. Prosecution and court data should also record whether hate motivation was alleged, accepted, rejected or not examined.

This is important because a system that only records the base offence, for example assault or property damage, will continue to understate the prevalence and pattern of hate-motivated offending. That in turn weakens public accountability and policy design. Accurate recording should be embedded across police, prosecution and sentencing practice.

### Question 17: Barriers to reporting hate crimes to police

There are major barriers to reporting hate crimes to police. For many LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people, police in a country of origin or transit were not a source of safety. They may have been a source of violence, extortion, humiliation or indifference. Those histories do not disappear on arrival in Australia. They shape whether a person believes reporting is safe, useful or likely to produce a fair response.

Other barriers include low confidence that the report will be understood, limited knowledge of legal pathways, trauma, language barriers, and fear connected to insecure migration status. These are not theoretical barriers. They affect whether a person reports at all, what details they disclose, and whether they stay engaged with the process.

ACT Policing has made an attempt of establishing an LGBTIQ+ Liaison Officer (LLO) role, yet chose to abolish it. Based on our engagements, we are disappointed that the ACT Policing lacked an understanding that significant work to build and re-build trust between the law enforcement and LGBTIQ+ communities was required prior to deciding

to abolish the role. We also had concerns about the scope of the role, which relied on victims of crimes approaching the LLO, as opposed to an active outreach from the LLO. The benefits of the LLO role within the ACT Policing were that this was a dedicated full-time role as opposed to a similar role at AFP which was a volunteer engagement any police officer could choose to undertake.

### Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

10. Require ACT Policing to reinstate the LGBTIQ+ Liaison Officer role.

FDPN recommends that ACT Policing:

11. Reinstate the LGBTIQ+ Liaison Officer role, and require the LLO to meaningfully engage with LGBTIQ+ communities to build trust.
12. Undertake proactive and sustained outreach with LGBTIQ+ communities including those who are forcibly displaced people.
13. Mandate the training for all staff on working with LGBTIQ+ communities, including specifically with LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people.
  - a. The training on working with LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people should be designed and delivered by LGBTIQ+ refugee-led organisations

### Question 18: Availability of support services

There are no dedicated legal support services for LGBTIQ+ people, and in particular for LGBTIQ+ forcibly displaced people in the ACT, funded to provide legal information, advice and representation on matters of unlawful vilification, serious vilification and hate crimes. While it is possible to argue that Legal Aid and other community legal services may assist, practice shows that such supports are either dependent upon the initiative of individual workers or are not responsive to the needs of LGBTIQ+ people.

### Case study 3

Ansu and Manjula, a queer couple, were attacked on the street. The attack was motivated by hate as the perpetrator knew they were a couple through university. The attack happened in the public place. Ansu and Manjula were holding hands, while waiting for a taxi to get home. Police and paramedics were called, as Ansu sustained bodily harm. Police interviewed both Ansu and Manjula at the scene.

Given that the perpetrator was known to Ansu and Manjula, they decided to take a personal protection order (PPO) against him. They also wanted to obtain some legal advice about their options and the process, but there were no

services to access. A legal service for women who are victims/survivors of domestic and family violence (DFV) could not see them, given that the attack was not DFV. Legal Aid helped with the PPO, but did not elaborate more on the hate motivation for the attack, deeming it irrelevant to the PPO.

When the application was heard at the court, the perpetrator denied the hate motivation. He claimed to have been intoxicated, and that he did not remember the attack at all. PPO was granted, nevertheless.

In the meantime, police did not keep Ansu and Manjula up to date about the status of the prosecution. Despite repeated calls, no updates were shared. On the day that the case was to be heard at the court, police reached out to them asking to submit their witness impact statement. Ansu and Manjula had 2 hours before the hearing to do so. They asked if the statement could be delivered in person but were denied this request. They were assured that the statement would be read. They were not informed of the outcomes of the court case for 2 weeks, after the sentencing was delivered.

## Recommendations

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

14. Funds an establishment of a dedicated community legal service (or a dedicated service offering within a current community legal service) to deliver integrated support through a holistic lawyer and social worker model for LGBTIQ+ people victims of vilification and hate crimes.
15. Funds justice system peer-navigators who can provide one-to-one support across dealing with police, the Human Rights Commission, ACAT, and criminal justice.
  - a. Support must be culturally responsive, LGBTIQ+ inclusive, migration-aware and accessible to people with disability.

## Question 19: Other suggestions for the prevention of hate crime

Prevention of vilification and hate crimes must go beyond criminal law. The ACT should invest in public education, community-led anti-hate campaigns, online safety work, service sector training, and better data collection. Prevention efforts should name and address intersecting harms, including racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia, homophobia, transphobia, ableism and anti-immigration hostility.

The ACT already has policy infrastructure that could support this work. The Capital of Equality Strategy 2024–2029 includes goals around promoting awareness, improving services, advancing legal reforms and supporting resilient LGBTIQ+ communities. Hate crime prevention work should be integrated into this framework and resourced through stable funding, not treated as one-off messaging.

Prevention campaigns must also be genuinely intersectional. Too often, work on refugee rights omits LGBTIQA+ people, and work on LGBTIQA+ equality omits migrants, refugees, people of colour and people with disability. That gap leaves many people unseen. Community organisations need sustained funding to do prevention, early intervention, digital safety support and post-incident care in ways that reflect lived realities.

### **Recommendations**

FDPN recommends that the ACT Government:

- 16.** Fund awareness-raising campaigns on the human rights of LGBTIQA+ people, delivered in intersectional ways.
- 17.** Fund awareness-raising and prevention campaigns to increase understanding of the legal protections available in vilification and hate crimes cases.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to make a submission. FDPN looks forward to engaging with the ACT Government further on these reforms.