

## Stalking Commission Response: Abridged Version

*This document is an abridged version of the feedback I wish to provide to the Victorian Law Reform Commission in response to the Stalking submission. For further information or inquiries, please contact the email previously provided.*

★★★★★

### BRIEF RESPONSES for 1-13q

ONE: *The action or inaction of the progression of the victim's report could be the determining factor of whether persons experiencing stalking report experience to authorities:*

**Action=** *Making the victim face the perpetrator which could further endanger the victim or if the perpetrator was charged with a fine and was inaccurately judged, the perpetrator might feel betrayed by the victim and may become hostile by escalating their actions to threats/violence*

**Inaction=** *Dismissing or not progressing with the victim's case and believing that the victim's experience is not as critical as other cases and the victim may feel resent towards authorities*

The factors that can influence whether people who experience stalking report their experiences to police can be, but not limited to, the following:

- The childhood of the person experiencing stalking
- the person experiencing stalking's values, beliefs and morals
- The attitude and behaviours of friends and family discouraging police involvement
- The immediate social and physical environment of the person experiencing stalking
- The person experiencing stalking's previous history with the police or other authorities
- The the person experiencing stalking's reputation and criminal record (e.g. the person experiencing stalking has been convicted of theft, driving while under the influence, etc)

A barrier could be how the report is not in their control and their report is being decided upon by others who were not involved, do not understand the emotional turmoil or mental exhaustion that occurred after the experience or anything about how they are coping and trying to move forward in their life. Perhaps if victims were involved in the report rather than be unaware of the proceedings of their report, victims may feel more inclined to report without doubts or fears.

*TWO:* A risk assessment framework **should** be developed to help police and courts identify the course of conduct and manage risk of serious harm in the context of stalking. The framework could consider precipitating factors involving both the person being stalked and the person who is accused of stalking. With the consideration of precipitating factors from both parties, both the person being stalked and the person stalking would be assessed fairly without partiality. With both parties being assessed, any misconceptions, medical conditions (erotomania) or false claims from the complainant would also be resolved at an expedited rate.

*THREE:* Agencies could further assess perpetrators of stalking and identify the level of risk by screening both the victim and the perpetrator and having access to both parties' criminal, medical and other related records/documents. It is worth noting that both parties records should be viewed with an unbiased perception and that any crimes that either party may have committed in their past (theft, possession of drugs, etc) should not influence the outcome of the case as, unless they are related or match the victims experience (e.g. had personal belongings stolen, had the perpetrator attack them while under the influence, etc). Expert advice should also be sought out by other organisations. This would allow for a more fair and accurate outcome and allow for less room for error when determining whether or not the alleged perpetrator is a potential threat if they remained in the community. Special training should also be mandated for law enforcers to follow when dealing with stalking cases. The training should cover how to build a professional rapport with the victim to ensure that they are providing all information relating to their experience and feel comfortable while doing so and how to inform the victim if their case can no longer progress due to their being no lead or due to other circumstances.

*FOUR:* Approaches and techniques involving stalking reports should chiefly concentrate on ways to not cause the victim to feel disempowered. If the victim feels disempowered, the victim could go through victimisation a second time. It would also benefit the victim if the alleged perpetrator was detained in their home or monitored while being investigated. This would allow the victim to feel safe while the investigation is underway and would restrict the alleged from contacting or threatening the victim and would not restrict the victim from going to certain locations out of fear that the perpetrator could be waiting for them. This would also serve as a safeguard for victims from being exposed to any potential violence or aggression from the alleged (continuing harassing or escalating their actions to violence/threats).

*FIVE:* There should be a similar framework for information sharing between agencies providing services for stalking as there are for the family violence intervention order system (FVIOS). The framework should act uniformly to the framework of the FVIOS. Information sharing between agencies should act as an aid for victims.

SIX: There should be a specific police Code of Practice for reports of stalking. The areas that should be covered involve:

- Engaging with appropriate referrals to further assist the person being stalked
- How to manage and handle reports with a sense of urgency, how to gather evidence from the person being stalked ethically
- Responding to the person being stalked through consistent follow-ups about their case instead of not engaging with them or inform the person being stalked that their case has been discontinued

SEVEN: There should be an option under the Personal Safety Intervention Orders Act 2010 (Vic) for police to be able to issue the equivalent of a Family Violence Safety Notice. If a victim is under direct threat, police should strive to protect the victim under no circumstances. This would be another preventive measure that would better safeguard victims and further protect them.

EIGHT: A person making an application for a personal safety intervention order should be able to do so online. Those who are in immediate danger or have someone consistently or are under constant surveillance, such as being habitually monitored/checked up on them should be eligible to make an application online.

NINE: Respondents should be prevented from personally cross-examining the affected person in some personal safety intervention order matters. In the circumstances that the person being stalked is intimidated by the respondent, whether it be a family member, stranger, acquaintance, work or class colleague, the person being stalked should not have to be personally cross-examined where they may feel re-victimised or feel as though they are somehow responsible for the perpetrators actions. If personally cross-examined by the respondent, the person being stalked could feel less confident in recounting their experience, which may make the person affected come across as unreliable or seeking some form of revenge against the alleged perpetrator. By excusing the person being stalked from being personally

cross-examined, they would be more confident in recounting their experience, would not forget any crucial details or feel the need to change their story due to feeling like the criminal instead of the one who is affected in the situation.

TEN: In strict circumstances where the respondent has a history of mental illness, the courts would be able to order the respondent to attend treatment programs. The programs could be, but not limited to:

- Programs that focus on understanding social cues
- Workshops working on healthy relationships and ways to handle rejection in a healthy manner
- Programs that teach what is/is not acceptable in conversations and what actions may hinder someone from developing a congenial relationship with others

TWELVE: The restrictions on publication in the Personal Safety Intervention Orders Act 2010 (Vic) should be expanded to cover adults. If an adult who is being stalked does not feel safe or cannot be free from their perpetrator and wishes to apply for a Personal Safety Intervention Order, then it should be absolutely necessary that the adult who is being affected should have their wishes fulfilled.

THIRTEEN: There should be free legal representation in some personal safety intervention order matters. The eligibility criteria to be applicable would be those who are:

- Disadvantaged
- Unable to access their income as they have a partner/family member controlling their finances
- From a low-economic status or reliant on their career to sustain their life but are stalked by their boss/ work colleague

---

## **ABSTRACT: A SUMMARISATION OF 14-30q**

Appeal processes for intervention orders should be better accommodating to persons who are being stalked. The criminal law response to stalking can also be improved and more protections for victim survivors in stalking prosecutions should be considered. With recognition that stalking is a process and can last for years taking a toll on the person being pursued, the act of stalking should be further criminalised in Victoria and new approaches and methods to reduce stalking-related crimes should be carefully reviewed to ensure that the victim is not acknowledged with minimal regard. At this current point of time, introductions to new measures and preventive strategies should be further researched and reviewed to warrant that there are no loopholes that the perpetrator could take advantage of. Further research and testing should be optimal.

The courts should also be able to request specialist risk assessment reports for stalking related crimes. If the requests are in need to help a case progress forward, the courts should have access to risk assessment reports. This would allow courts to make more accurate based judgements and decisions when giving sentences (mitigating/aggravating elements) or determining a fair outcome. This action would also support victims in their trial to reassure them that the acts that were committed against them were in fact illegal and wrong. With no knowledge of the parties, imprecise outcomes from the courts (e.g. dismissing/providing lenient sanctions) could pose a great threat to the victim, the community and the State.

Electronic monitoring should be introduced to monitor people who have been assessed as posing a high risk of ongoing stalking behaviour based on the circumstances that:

- The perpetrator has malicious intent to harm or harass the victim
- The perpetrator is a danger to the community, the victim or themselves
- The perpetrator is convinced that the victim is their soulmate and refuses to leave them alone

- The perpetrator has consistently stalked the victim to the point the victim fears going out or fears their own home
- The perpetrator has caused the victim to fear for their safety, feel paranoid and feel that they no longer have freedom or privacy

Electronic monitoring would act as a form of protection for the person who is being stalked. It would also allow authorities to locate the perpetrator at any time, which gives authorities more time to focus on other pending reports. Electronic monitoring would be an overall benefit for the community.

The barriers that some victim survivors experience when seeking help for cyberstalking could include, but not limited to:

- Inability to identify the perpetrator
- Inability to trace back harassment calls due to the perpetrator activating no caller ID
- Inability to access their accounts due to unauthorised persons accessing their account and changing the password
- Attempting to threaten or blackmail the victim if they sought help or told someone
- Having someone create accounts of the victim and impersonating them where the account is affecting the victim's personal life
- Tracing the perpetrator's IP address however finding out the perpetrator lives in another state/country
- Being told by other people (family/friends/partner) that the cyber-stalking cannot harm them in reality
- Being under constant surveillance of the perpetrator where they have access to the victim's camera and hard-drive

If a person suspects that they are being kept under surveillance using cyberstalking, they should immediately seek help. Persons who are being stalked should be encouraged to contact their local authorities if they are in immediate danger. If the victim has the belief they are being stalked but is not quite sure how to approach authorities or does not feel comfortable in doing so, the victim could contact helplines or visit support centres (e.g. Family Violence centres) and ask for support or advice, which could empower them to seek legal action against the person who is stalking them.

The ways apps and smart devices could be used to facilitate stalking could involve, but not limited to:

- Information gathering
- Hacking or spying on the victim
- Learning about the victim involuntarily
- Attaching viruses to the victim's device
- Tracking the victim and keeping them under surveillance
- Consistently harassing the victim by mass-messaging them or calling them every week
- Threatening or blackmailing the victim to follow their commands (mostly involving cases with leaked images or texts)
- Creating anonymous/burner accounts (without identity) to either anonymously see the victim's activity, what their interests are and what they post (can involve screenshotting the victim's pictures without the victim's knowledge)
- Storing and keeping images and videos of the victim on their device to feel closer to the victim or using their photos and videos with the intent to humiliate the victim
- Accessing the victim's personal/professional email address or phone number and contacting the victim's boss, work colleagues, teacher, class peers, family members, romantic partner and friends to damage the victim's reputation and relationships
- Creating Sock puppet accounts to get closer to the victim and convincing either the victim or their mutuals that the person they are talking to is real rather than made up (usually involves consistent story-telling to be accounted as 'real' on a superficial basis and avoiding suspicion)
- Restricting the victim from accessing their personal accounts by changing their password or putting restrictions on the victim's devices where the perpetrator knows the password  
*\*most commonly found in family/spousal reports but can also include cases where the perpetrator is someone the victim knows and they will provide access to their accounts/devices in exchange for a favour\**

*A stalking-based resource centre, a local stalking hotline or a website dedicated to stalking victims and how they can be supported could be a potential control that could be put into place to protect victims of stalking. In terms of technology-facilitated preventions, a control that could be put into place could involve a trusted and licenced third party (e.g. social worker) who works*

*alongside and supports the victim throughout the harassment. The third party can support the victim by having the victim share documents or provide copies of messages and duplicated voice memos from the perpetrator. The third party can review any suspicious activity or assess if the victim is under any threat. With the assistance of a third party, the victim would not carry the burden of feeling alone and powerless in their situation.*

Having stalking laws updated would be a justice to the State. Having stalking acts considered as a serious crime would better protect the people in the community from feeling unsafe, trapped and inadequate. Victoria should redefine what stalking is and how the State can protect the community from becoming victims to a potential hazardous crime.



## Application of Stalking Law Reform Concept: *STING* Reform

---

### ***S . T . I . N . G***

Sexual Violence & Sadistic Tendacies • Theft & Trespassing • Indecency & Inappropriate Behaviour • Nuisance & Negligence • Graphic Content & Gang Involvement

---

★★★★★

In accordance with the Victorian Law Commission seeking ways to mitigate stalking within the community, I would like to take this opportunity to propose a reform that could be used to address an array of elements that can be reviewed under the definition of stalking and what stalking is; the *STING* Reform.

The proposal of *STING* would assist people who have been experiencing behaviours or events that would be considered as predatory or intimidating to recognise that these circumstances are not conventional or legal; therefore *STING* would hopefully encourage the person experiencing one or more of the acts listed in *STING* to confidently report their experience to authorities and to take action before they are in a higher-risk situation where their life may be in danger.

### ***What is STING?***

*STING* is an independent distinctive anti stalking reform that strives to protect the community from having their privacy invaded or having their freedom impinged by another. *STING* would take on both online and in person stalking acts.

*STING* is a reform that is composed of 5 sections that covers different classifications of stalking. The 5 sections are used to help the community to determine whether or not certain actions that may have been against them by another are considered indictable. The 5 sections break down actions that can be committed against another person and demonstrate how severe each act is. *STING* could also assist the courts with delivering sound outcomes, expeditiously sanction convicted perpetrators and

appropriately give sentences to perpetrators who have committed other offences concurrently with stalking crimes and stalking categories. *STING* is intended to abolish any loopholes regarding stalking offences (e.g. mitigating factors) and to allow the courts to make quicker judgements about the outcome of stalking cases.

### *What is the purpose of the STING Reform?*

The *STING* Reform aims to prevent the act of stalking committed against another person and protect those who have been, who are currently being stalked and those who believe they are being stalked. The *STING* Reform can be applied to re-educate the Victorian public on what behaviour is tolerated and what behaviour could be accounted as stalking. *STING* can also be used to encourage victims to seek help if they feel unsafe.

The overall purpose of the *STING* Reform is to assist in criminalising stalking acts in Victoria.

### *What would the STING Reform cover?*

The *STING* Reform would cover separate, independent stalking offences and a range of other offences that cross over with stalking offences. *STING* would also cover stalking offences by:

- Partners
- Strangers
- Class peers
- Acquaintances
- Family members
- Work colleagues
- Individuals who are in an authoritative position

*STING* would be able to manage unique cases that are conventionally difficult to interpret and assist persons who have an estranged relationship with the person who

is stalking them (e.g. the person they were once living with or were once under the care of).

---

### *THE FIVE (V) SECTIONS OF STING: A SUMMARY OF EACH SECTION*

Stalking is a crime that is complex to define as an independence. Therefore with the application of the *STING* Reform's 5 divergent sections, the courts could use the reform to evaluate the risk associated with the perpetrator and how the perpetrator might escalate their actions if left unchecked. *STING* could also act as a support tool for persons who have been or are currently being stalked by providing them a brief outline on stalking and specified categories that they can access and use. *STING* can also help people who are struggling to identify whether they are being stalked or not.

#### Section I of STING: Sexual Violence & Sadistic Tendencies

Section I of the *STING* Reform would focus primarily on ***Sexual Violence & Sadistic Tendencies*** from perpetrators (generally category 5/high-risk individuals) in stalking crimes.

Section I would deal in stalking offences that relate to the acts of sexual violence involving, but not limited to:

- Forceful kissing without consent
- Disrespecting and/or defiling the victim
- Forcing the victim to initiate in sexual activities against their will
- Harming the victim while penetrating/attempting to penetrate them
- Becoming sexually aroused from injuring, overpowering and intimidating the victim
- Inappropriate physical contact of the body (stroking/touching/grabbing without consent)
- Verbally abusing, overpowering and yelling at the victim while touching/attempting to touch the victim

Section I would also deal with stalking offences that relate to the acts of sadistic tendencies involving, but not limited to:

- Inability to handle their temper with the victim
- Excessive cruelty or domination over the victim
- Mentally tormenting the victim for long periods of time
- Fantasises about humiliating, degrading or injuring the victim
- Being forceful towards the victim (shoving, hitting or threatening)
- Causing emotional and physical harm (without penetration) towards the victim
- Being forceful in their manner or inflicting pain onto the victim or the victim's pets
- Ability to readily manipulate other people around them to be perceived as a good person

With the engagement of non-consensual acts of violence (sexual and degradation) from the perpetrator, Section I would help the courts better identify how dangerous the perpetrator is and what would be a suitable sanction for them. It should be noted that Perpetrators categorised in Section I have a higher chance of re-offending and should be handled accordingly without lenient punishment.

### Section II of STING: Theft & Trespassing

Section II of the *STING* Reform would involve acts where the interference of the victims property. This involves the victim's house or material objects that have been tampered with or stolen by the perpetrator. Perpetrators who commit ***Theft & Trespassing*** are generally category 5/ high-risk individuals in stalking crimes.

Section II would deal in stalking offences that relate to the acts of:

- Collecting and stealing from the victim's house, work, school locker, etc
- Leaving items in the victim's house for the victim to notice (e.g. notes or gifts)
- Trespassing onto premises where the perpetrator does not have authorisation to do so
- Locating the victim while they are at work or Institution (e.g. school) and waiting for them to leave
- Locating the victim's home address and attempting or successfully entering the victim's house while they are there or not
- Following the victim to a partner's/friend's//family member's home and trespassing onto their property without their knowledge
- Stealing the victim's mail and using the contents to better know and understand the victim and going through the victim's garbage to feel personally closer to them

The risk associated with these kinds of acts can turn violent if the perpetrator is overly attached to the victim and becomes jealous and resents everyone in the victim's personal life. This section would also cover the intersection of homicide and stalking where the perpetrator would be dually responsible and convicted of both crimes accordingly instead of being held responsible for one crime with aggravating factors.

Section II would also have some elements of voyeurism (with or without the intent to harm the victim or any other third parties the victim may be accompanied by) and would be responsible for stalking crimes that involve the perpetrator watching the victim while they are by themselves/ with another person without the victim's knowledge.

### Section III of STING: Indecency & inappropriate behaviour

Section III of the *STING* Reform would manage stalking crimes that deal with the perpetrator's behaviour and unlawful actions. Perpetrators who commit ***Indecency & Inappropriate behaviour*** acts are usually category 3 to 4/med to high-risk individuals in stalking crimes.

Section III would concern stalking crimes that are associated with Indecency that involve, but not limited to:

- Bullying or harassing another person
- Consistently invading another person's personal space
- Disrupting another person's welfare and sense of security
- Following someone for a long duration due to being rejected or humiliated by them
- Having delusive thoughts that the person they are observing is infatuated with them
- Providing unsolicited material to another person through the Internet or through face-to-face interactions
- Indecent exposure and exhibitionism (showing intimate body parts to someone nonconsensually or masturbating in front of someone unprovoked to initiate a sexual act)

Section III would also concern stalking crimes that are associated with inappropriate behaviour that involve, but not limited to:

- Being perverse in nature
- Following a person with the use of transport (e.g. car, bus, bike)
- Being preoccupied with what they want and dismissing the other person needs
- Displaying signs of aggressive behaviour or becoming violent in a matter of seconds
- Attempting or planning to inflict harm on the people the victim loves out of spite or jealousy
- Have someone under continual observation out of fear or paranoia that the person will speak ill of them to others
- Becoming obsessive (including non-sexual obsession) over the person they are targeting and wanting to know more about them

Perpetrators affiliated with Section III would commonly be individuals who are either infatuated with the victim and believe the mutually shares the same feeling or someone who resents the victim and wants to hurt and humiliate them. Regarding perpetrators who possess a low-risk threat, the perpetrator could be invited to support services where they can learn to control their behaviours and manage their emotions. If however the perpetrator poses a high-risk threat, perhaps the perpetrator could be sanctioned with more stringency to better protect the victim and the community.

### Section IV of STING: Nuisance & Negligence

Section IV of the *STING* Reform would concentrate on ***Nuisance & Negligence*** offences from perpetrators (typically category 3/med-risk individuals) pertaining to stalking crimes.

Section IV would address stalking crimes that relate to Nuisance offences that involve, but not limited to the perpetrator:

- Constantly following the victim without an agenda
- Sending unwanted gifts or letters to the victim's home address or their workplace
- Leaving offensive or delusional messages (voicemails/emails/texts) for the victim to hear
- Persistently trying to engage with the victim even when they feel threatened or uncomfortable
- Attempting to befriend or interact with the victim's family and friends to become closer to the victim
- Wanting to stay in close proximity of the victim at all times while disregarding what the victim feels or thinks
- Constantly calling the victim while they are at home or at work to 'check up' on them or calling the victim on no-caller ID just to hear the victim speak

Section IV would also address stalking crimes that relate to Negligence offences involving, but not limited to the perpetrator:

- Reviewing the victim's search history
- Responding to the victim's personal emails or texts
- Demanding to know the victim's password to their devices
- Accessing and going through the victim's personal accounts
- Becoming immediately attached to victim or living vicariously through the victim
- Listening to the victim's voicemail or reading the victim's text without their knowledge
- Screenshooting or recording the victim's personal information with the use of another device

Perpetrators who commit stalking crimes relating to Nuisance and Negligence offences are often the kin of the victim (family member/s or significant other). Perpetrators of Nuisance and Negligence offences tend to spread false rumours about the victim or attempt to represent the victim in a disagreeable manner or try to make the victim seem to be in an unstable state of mind. The perpetrator slanders the victim to deter others from engaging with them or to impede others from building a healthy relationship with the victim. The perpetrator may be jealous of the victim or feel threatened by them in some way (viewing the victim as competition or fearing that the victim is too independent/confident) and the perpetrator might stalk the victim intentionally/unintentionally.

Perpetrators categorised in Section IV can be a potential risk to the victim and the community. Depending on each case, the perpetrator could be concerned for the victim but does not know how to approach the victim in a healthy, mature and nurturing way. This specific perpetrator would be considered low-risk to the victim and to the community if they looked into tools to help them cope with their emotions and workshops that focus on behaviour (what is and is not acceptable). However if the perpetrator has threatened the victim's life, has harmed them in any way or has damaged their reputation where it cannot be repaired, the perpetrator may be measured as higher-risk.

### Section V of STING- Graphic Content and Gang Involvement



Section V of the *STING* Reform would involve unique acts where the perpetrator takes advantage of social networks and/or involves other persons (friends, family members or acquaintances) in the act of stalking a person who may have humiliated, rejected or irritated the perpetrator/s. Perpetrators who commit related offences in this particular section would be a category 5/high-risk individual in stalking crimes.

Section V would explore how Graphic Content can affect both the perpetrator (unrealistic expectations on romance or violence) and the victim involving stalking laws. Section V would involve the acts of, but would not be limited to the perpetrator:

- Doxxing someone for their own benefit
- Screenshotting the victim's leaked photographs of their body
- Attempting to recreate a scene from a graphic film, game, etc
- Discreetly recording or taking pictures of the victim from inappropriate angles
- Impersonating and talking to others under the pretence that they are the victim
- Using technology to spy, record and observe the victim's movements if the victim is in close proximity
- Creating private or anonymous accounts to dedicate and demonstrate their affection for the victim (this could also include tributes and replicating the victim's social media accounts and sending messages to themselves from the replicated account, pretending the victim sent them)

Section V would also explore how Gang crimes relating to stalking crimes can involve, but not be limited to the perpetrators:

- Verbally threatening the victim
- Following the victim with malicious intent to harm
- Use of weapons to intimidate or physically injure the victim
- Coaxing the victim to come outside while the victim is home
- Teasing or harassing the victim based on their physical makeup or characteristics

- Sending pictures of the victim to the victim to let them know that they are being watched
- Attacking the victim online by mass spamming the victim death threats or hate-fuelled messages

Gang stalking is a crime that is unparalleled to traditional stalking. There are many more external factors to consider and what type of character each participating member is from the gang and measuring how unpredictable and dangerous they are. A measure that could be considered to better understand each member is to assess them while they are with their group first and then when they are immediately removed from their group. This could show who are the more dangerous and aggressive members and who are the more weaker and influenced members.

### *How will the STING Reform help the community be better informed about stalking and how will STING protect the community?*

In pursuit of identifying ways to bring attention to stalking crimes in Victoria and to further encourage the community to shift their attitudes towards stalking crimes, *STING* intends to empower and drive change into the community and their current outlook on stalking. It is critical for *STING* to challenge the current views on stalking in the community, as the overall beliefs and values of the community influences a range of factors and stakeholders. The primary stakeholders who are affected by stalking crimes are the victims, the victim's kin, the perpetrator and support agencies.

If the overall community does not understand the fundamentals of stalking and how the act can affect someone, then what makes the courts certain that victims of stalking recognise whether the acts against them is stalking or not?

If the act of stalking is tolerable in the community, how are the victim's kin supposed to support them through their time of vulnerability? What if the victim is blamed instead of the perpetrator by their own kin?

If stalking is a common practice amongst the community but rarely reported, how are support agencies and services supposed to help reduce the victim's suffering?

If a perpetrator does not consciously distinguish between what behaviour is tolerated and what is not as each person responds differently to conversations and actions, how can the perpetrator be appropriately sanctioned/excused?

To fill in these questions, the outline of *STING* would help victims to determine if they are being stalked, encourage perpetrator's to rethink their actions and assess whether their previous or current actions is a form of stalking and to urge the public to educate themselves on what should be accepted and what should be prohibited in the community.

Due to there being a lack of awareness in the community, the *STING* Reform could be accessible for the general public to access the 5 different categories to see what is appropriate/inappropriate behaviour that would constitute as an act of stalking in Victoria . *STING* should act as a barrier for victim's, help courts assess and expedite decisions in stalking cases and better educate the community about stalking. *STING* could also help deter potential perpetrator's from stalking and help victims identify with their experience with more accuracy and clarity.

The penalty for pursuants who are caught or have been reported by the victim and have been identified as the perpetrator could be anywhere from a fine (low-risk threat) to a more harsh sanction (high-risk).

Crimes associated with stalking can be at times onerous for courts to distinguish, interpret and to sentence an alleged perpetrator with precise accuracy if the evidence against the alleged is inadequate. Therefore, the *STING* Reform would be used to handle the discourse of stalking crimes and promote recognition regarding stalking on a broader scope and simplify what behaviour is unlawful.

By no change in the course of stalking sentencing, the crimes related to stalking will sustain and no rectification in Victoria will be established.

*\*The current version of STING can always be adapted or improved. This version is an a preliminary outline of what offences can be further investigated\**