



Decision and Reasons for Decision

Citation: *G59 and Queensland Police Service [2026] QICmr 36*
(9 March 2026)

Application Number: 318514

Applicant: G59

Respondent: Queensland Police Service

Decision Date: 9 March 2026

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION -
documents regarding police investigations relating to a
deceased relative of the applicant - refusal of access under
section 47(3)(a) and schedule 3, section 10(4) of the *Right to
Information Act 2009* (Qld)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION -
application by eligible family member of a deceased person
- personal information and privacy - contrary to public
information - refusal of access under section 47(3)(b) of the
Right to Information Act 2009 (Qld)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION -
information unrelated to terms of the application - deletion
of irrelevant information under section 73 of the *Right to
Information Act 2009* (Qld)

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

1. The applicant applied to the Queensland Police Service (**QPS**) under the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**)¹ for access to a range of documents regarding his brother, including call outs to his brother's residence, any interactions with his brother and QPS's investigation into his brother's death.²
2. QPS initially advised the applicant that it considered the work involved in processing the access application would substantially and unreasonably divert QPS's resources and provided him with an opportunity to alter or clarify the scope of his application.³ Although the applicant proposed a narrowed scope,⁴ QPS did not make a decision within the

¹ On 1 July 2025 parts of the *Information Privacy and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2023* (Qld) (**IPOLA Act**) came into force, effecting changes to the RTI Act and *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) (**IP Act**). As the access application was made before the legislative changes, the RTI Act and IP Act as in force prior to 1 July 2025 remain applicable in accordance with transitional provisions in Chapter 7, Part 9 of the RTI Act.

² Access application dated 21 November 2024.

³ QPS's letter to the applicant dated 28 January 2025 in accordance with section 42 of the RTI Act.

⁴ By email to QPS dated 30 January 2025.

processing period⁵ and was therefore deemed to have refused access to the requested documents.⁶

External review process

3. The applicant applied to the Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for external review of QPS's deemed decision.⁷ OIC accepted the application for external review and obtained a copy of the documents located from QPS.⁸
4. QPS confirmed to OIC that it had located 103 pages, 1 audio recording and 14 body worn camera (**BWC**) recordings, and agreed to disclose 11 pages and parts of 60 pages, part of the audio recording, and parts of seven BWC recordings (via inspection only).⁹
5. OIC conveyed a preliminary view to the applicant that access to the remaining information¹⁰ could be refused under the RTI Act.¹¹ The applicant did not accept the preliminary view nor pursue inspection access to the BWC recordings, and submitted that access to the remaining information should be granted.¹²
6. The remaining¹³ information for determination in this review comprises:

Description ¹⁴	Information
<p>Police Report</p> <p><i>Information pertaining to other individuals within the police report and attachments relating to the investigation of the death of the applicant's brother</i></p>	<p>Part of pages 12-13, 15-18, 52-54, 56-57, 62, 64-80 and 86-88.</p> <p>Pages 1-8, 11, 14, 19-35, 37-50, 55, 58-61, 63, 83-85, 91, 94-101 and 103.</p>
<p>Recordings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mentions of another individual's personal information in the audio recording; and</i> • <i>BWC recordings at the applicant's brother's address following his death and discussions with witnesses</i> 	<p>Part of the audio recording and 14 BWC recordings</p>
<p>Notebook Entries</p> <p><i>Entries within an official police notebook that are about other matters dealt with by QPS</i></p>	<p>Contained within pages 82 and 85</p>

⁵ By email to QPS dated 4 March 2025, the applicant advised QPS that he 'will not grant any further extension' to the processing period as request by QPS in a letter to the applicant dated 5 March 2025.

⁶ Conveyed to the applicant by Notice of Deemed Decision dated 7 March 2025. The deemed decision is the *reviewable decision* for the purpose of this review.

⁷ External review application dated 14 March 2025.

⁸ By letters dated 29 April 2025.

⁹ Submissions dated 14 May 2025, 30 July 2025 and 13 October 2025. In an email dated 20 October 2025 QPS confirmed the information was sent to the applicant.

¹⁰ Including to full copies of the 7 BWC recordings subject of QPS's offer of partial access via inspection.

¹¹ By letters dated 16 October 2025 and 17 February 2026.

¹² Submissions dated 18, 19 and 20 October 2025, 4, 6, 7, 13 and 28 November 2025, 1 December 2025 and 27 February 2026.

¹³ In his submission dated 6 November 2025, the applicant raised concerns that QPS had not located 'all of the information that [he] sent to ... Police during 2022'. However, in his narrowing scope email to QPS dated 30 January 2025, the applicant specifically excluded all emails he sent to the Police Station during 2022 and 2023. Accordingly, this review was conducted on the basis that the applicant had excluded such emails and therefore, I have not examined this as a sufficiency of search issue.

¹⁴ I am limited in the extent to which I can describe the remaining information, due to section 108 of the RTI Act.

7. For the reasons set out below, I vary QPS's deemed decision and find that:
- access to the Police Report may be refused under section 47(3)(a) and schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act on the basis it comprises exempt information
 - access to the Recordings may be refused under section 47(3)(b) on the basis they comprise contrary to public interest information; and
 - the Notebook Entries may be deleted under section 73 of the RTI Act on the basis it is not relevant to the scope of the access application.
8. In making this decision, I have taken into account evidence, submissions, legislation and other material as set out in these reasons.¹⁵ I have had regard to the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) (**HR Act**), particularly the right to seek and receive information,¹⁶ and in doing so, I have acted in accordance with section 58(1) of the HR Act.¹⁷

Police Report

9. The RTI Act provides individuals with a general right to access documents held by a Queensland government agency.¹⁸ The right of access is subject to certain limitations, including grounds for refusing access.¹⁹ However, it is Parliament's intention that the RTI Act is to be administered with a pro-disclosure bias²⁰ and that the grounds for refusing access to information are interpreted narrowly.²¹
10. Access may be refused to exempt information²² and schedule 3 of the RTI Act sets out the categories of such information, the disclosure of which Parliament has determined is contrary to the public interest.²³ Where it is established that information is exempt, the Information Commissioner does not have power to direct that access be given.²⁴
11. One category of exempt information is set out in Schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act (**Prescribed Crime Body Exemption**). Information will be subject to this exemption if:
- it was '*obtained, used or prepared for an investigation*'
 - the investigation was conducted by a prescribed crime body, or another agency, in the performance of the prescribed functions of the prescribed crime body; **and**
 - the exception in schedule 3, section 10(6) of the RTI Act does not apply.
12. The terms '*obtained, used or prepared*' are not defined in the RTI Act or the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954* (Qld), and so are to be given their ordinary meaning in accordance with the principles of statutory interpretation.²⁵ The term '*investigation*' as

¹⁵ Including footnotes.

¹⁶ Section 21 of the HR Act.

¹⁷ OIC's approach to the HR Act set out in this paragraph has been considered and endorsed by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal in *Lawrence v Queensland Police Service* [2022] QCATA 134 at [23].

¹⁸ Section 23 of the RTI Act.

¹⁹ Section 47 of the RTI Act.

²⁰ Section 44 of the RTI Act.

²¹ Section 47(2)(a) of the RTI Act.

²² Sections 47(3)(a) and 48 of the RTI Act.

²³ Section 48(2) of the RTI Act.

²⁴ Section 105(2) of the RTI Act.

²⁵ In *Springborg MP and Crime and Misconduct Commission; RZ (Access Applicant), BX (Fourth Party), Director-General of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General (Fifth Party)* (2006) 7 QAR 77 (**Springborg**) at [27] the Information Commissioner noted the term 'prepared' meant '*compose and write out, draw up (a text or document) ... produce or form ... manufacture, make*'.

used in the Prescribed Crime Body Exemption has been defined expansively and includes the mere examination or consideration of information.²⁶

13. The ambit of the Prescribed Crime Body Exemption is well-settled.²⁷ The Information Commissioner has held that the CCC's functions are triggered by receipt and consideration of a complaint, notification and/or relevant material, and not determined retrospectively by the outcome of an assessment or investigation²⁸ either by the CCC or other agency.²⁹ The Information Commissioner has also held that 'dealing with' or 'assessing' a complaint, notification or other material falls within the broad meaning of 'investigation' by the CCC or other agency.³⁰
14. The exception to the Prescribed Crime Body Exemption has consistently been found to apply to information 'about' the subject officer in the investigation, as distinguished from information pertaining to a complainant.³¹ The Information Commissioner has previously recognised that the purpose of the exception is to allow individuals who are the subject of a prescribed crime body investigation to obtain access to information regarding a finalised investigation, to the extent that information is 'about' them.³² That is, the exception allows the subject of an investigation access to information such as '*allegations made against them ... and conclusions made about them in a report*'.³³
15. The exemptions in schedule 3 to the RTI Act – including the Prescribed Crime Body Exemption – do not require or allow consideration of public interest factors. This is because Parliament has determined that disclosure of these categories of information would be contrary to the public interest.³⁴ Accordingly, if information falls within one of the categories of exempt information in schedule 3, a conclusive presumption exists that its disclosure would be contrary to the public interest, and no further consideration is permitted.³⁵

Submissions

16. In summary, QPS submits:³⁶
 - the applicant made a complaint about the investigation into the death of his brother and QPS's Ethical Standards Command (**ESC**) advised '*the complaint is closed but did relate to allegations of police misconduct*'
 - the Matters Assessed Report (**MAR**)³⁷ confirms '*the allegation, if proved, meets the definition of police misconduct*'

²⁶ *Springborg* analysed the concept of an 'investigation' as used in the provision of the repealed *Freedom of Information Act 1992* (Qld) that was the equivalent of schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act. In *Springborg*, the Information Commissioner determined that an investigation can encompass the process of examining, considering, 'dealing with' and 'assessing' a complaint, at [55]-[59]. Schedule 2 of the *Crime and Corruption Act 2001* (Qld) (**CC Act**) provides a non-exhaustive definition of 'investigate' as including 'examine and consider' – see also *Frecklington MP and Premier and Minister for Trade* [2020] QICmr 15 (18 March 2020) at [47].

²⁷ See *Cronin and Crime and Corruption Commission* [2017] QICmr 13 at [12]-[26] and *G31 and Queensland Police Service* [2024] QICmr 20 (22 May 2024) at [22]-[29].

²⁸ *Springborg* at [44].

²⁹ Schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act.

³⁰ *Springborg* at [55]-[59].

³¹ *G8KPL2 and Department of Health* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 31 January 2011) (**G8KPL2**) at [25]-[33]; *Darlington and Queensland Police Service* [2014] QICmr 14 (11 April 2014) at [18]-[22] and *W52 and Crime and Corruption Commission* [2021] QICmr 57 (28 October 2021) at [44]-[48].

³² *G8KPL2* at [28]-[33].

³³ *G8KPL2* at [28]-[33].

³⁴ Section 48(2) of the RTI Act.

³⁵ *Dawson-Wells v Office of the Information Commissioner & Anor* [2020] QCATA 60 at [17].

³⁶ Submission dated 30 July 2025.

³⁷ A MAR 'is supplied by the CCC in response to the QPS generated list of new matters provided by the QPS Complaint Assessment Committee'. A copy of the MAR relating to this matter was provided to OIC by QPS on 17 February 2026.

- the investigation is *'subject to the monitoring role of the [Crime and Corruption] Commission' (CCC)* which means the CCC may audit or review the manner in which QPS dealt with the complaint at any time
- inquiries were made with the investigating officer *'who advised the police report and all attachments were considered as part of the investigation, however the body worn camera footage was not considered as part of his investigation [and therefore] the exemption does not apply to the body worn footage'*.

17. In summary, the applicant submits:³⁸

- *'the ESC investigation into my complaint was finalized [sic] on 18 January 2023' and therefore 'information after that date could not be exempt information because it could not have been "obtained, used or prepared for" the investigation into my complaint'*
- it appears that some of the information within the Police Report is not subject to the Prescribed Crime Body Exemption *'because it came into existence after 18 January 2023'*; and
- any information created after 18 January 2023 *'should not be refused on that basis.'*

Findings

18. Based on the information available to me, I am satisfied that:

- the whole Police Report and attachments relating to the investigation of the death of the applicant's brother was used by QPS's ESC for the investigation into the applicant's complaint
- the complaint related to allegations that, if proven, would meet the definition of police misconduct
- the ESC investigation was conducted in the performance of the CCC's prescribed functions and is subject to monitoring by the CCC; and
- the exception to the exemption in schedule 3, section 10(6) of the RTI Act does not apply as the investigation is not about the applicant or his brother as the complainant or subject of the investigation complained about, rather it is about the subject officer/s of the ESC investigation.

19. On the basis of the above, I find that the Police Report comprises exempt information under schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act as it was obtained, used or prepared for an investigation by QPS's ESC in the performance of the CCC's prescribed functions and accordingly, access to the Police Report may be refused under section 47(3)(a) of the RTI Act.

Recordings

20. Access to information may be refused where its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.³⁹ The term *public interest* refers to considerations affecting the good order and functioning of the community and government affairs for the well-being of citizens. This means that in general, a public interest consideration is one which is common to all members of, or a substantial segment of, the community, as distinct from matters that concern purely private or personal interests.

³⁸ Submission dated 27 February 2026.

³⁹ Sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.

21. In assessing whether disclosure of information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, a decision-maker must take certain steps as set out in section 49(3) of the RTI Act, including, identifying and disregarding irrelevant factors, identifying factors for and against disclosure, and deciding whether, on balance, disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest.
22. Schedule 4 of the RTI Act contains factors that may be relevant in determining where the balance of public interest lies in a particular case I have considered these,⁴⁰ together with all other relevant information, in reaching my decision. I have also applied the IP Act's pro-disclosure bias⁴¹ and considered Parliament's intention that grounds for refusing access to information are to be interpreted narrowly.⁴²

Submissions

23. In summary, the applicant submits:⁴³
 - his brother died in suspicious circumstances
 - the witness account to QPS was *'false'* and it *'formed the basis under which the forensic pathologist had concluded that [his brother] had died of natural causes'*
 - his brother's death was not sufficiently investigated by QPS or the Coroner
 - the State Coroner's decision contains many items that are in contention, and he considers there are many reasons for why the matter should be reopened
 - he wishes to assess for himself that QPS *'did in fact carry out the comprehensive investigations as the State Coroner referred to in his letter'*
 - there are a *'significant amount of unanswered questions'* about his brother's death
 - the requested information *'will serve to determine what actions were taken by the Queensland Police Service, Queensland Health, and the Queensland Justice System to ensure that [his brother] received the justice he was entitled to'*
 - he considers that the *'only way to determine the facts at the crime scene recorded'* is to view the unredacted BWC recordings
 - he was regularly in contact with his brother by phone and his brother would freely discuss his medical condition with him
 - his request for access *'has nothing to do with any grieving process'*, rather he is *'trying to get answers and information that [he] is legally entitled to'*; and
 - it is *'most certainly in the Public's as well as the family interests why the QPS and Coroner have never further investigated this matter, and not afforded the deceased the justice he was entitled to.'*
24. The applicant's submissions also contain extensive commentary on the content of the documents disclosed to him, including his concerns regarding the accuracy of that content and the actions taken or not taken by QPS in relation to the investigation into his brother's death and the subsequent coronial process.

Findings

25. The information within the Recordings can generally be described as:

⁴⁰ I have considered each of the public interest factors outlined in schedule 4 of the RTI Act, and any relevant factors are discussed below. Some factors have no relevance, for example, the factor concerning innovation and the facilitation of research.

⁴¹ Section 44 of the RTI Act.

⁴² Section 47(2) of the RTI Act.

⁴³ As detailed in the external review application dated 14 March 2025 and submissions to OIC dated 22, 24 and 30 April 2025, 2, 6 and 7 May 2025, 10 July 2025, 1 September 2025, 18, 19 and 20 October 2025, 4, 6, 7, 13 and 28 November 2025, 1 December 2025 and 27 February 2026.

- visual recordings of the applicant's brother at the scene and of his home environment following his death (**brother's information**); and
 - information about other individuals including their names, contact details, visual/audio recordings of them, and statements and other information provided by them to QPS (**third-party information**).
26. I have not taken any irrelevant public interest factors into account in making this decision.
27. The applicant's brother's information comprises his personal information.⁴⁴ Based on the information before OIC, the applicant is an *'eligible family member'*⁴⁵ which raises a factor favouring disclosure.⁴⁶ This factor specifically recognises that there is a public interest in the eligible family member being given access to a deceased relative's information including where it is about their health and wellbeing. However, the weight given to this factor will vary depending on the circumstances.⁴⁷
28. I accept that the applicant was regularly in contact with his brother leading up to his death, that he was aware of the nature of his brother's medical conditions and home environment, and that he is aware of some of the circumstances surrounding his death. The brother's information is particularly sensitive given the context in which it appears and I have considered the extent to which this contributes to the weight of the opposing nondisclosure factor discussed below at paragraph 33. However, in terms of the weight to be afforded to the factor favouring disclosure, I consider it to be significant in this case.
29. The Information Commissioner has recognised that there is a public interest in the social and economic well-being of the community, which includes assisting bereaved family members in their grieving process.⁴⁸ I acknowledge that the applicant is seeking access to information to assist in understanding the circumstances of his brother's death. I consider providing access to the Recordings would allow the applicant to assess any further courses of action that he may wish to pursue to achieve closure. In the particular circumstances of this matter, taking into account the nature of the Recordings and the applicant's submissions, I afford the factor moderate weight.
30. I agree that QPS must be transparent and accountable in relation to how it deals with investigations of a sudden death.⁴⁹ The Recordings relate to QPS's investigation of the applicant's brother's death and includes the personal information of witnesses, public service officers and other involved individuals. While I accept that disclosing this type of information would advance these factors to some degree, considering the nature of the information I do not consider this to be in any significant way, particularly given the information which QPS has disclosed to the applicant. I am satisfied that the information which QPS has released to the applicant has served to further his understanding of how QPS dealt with the investigation into his brother's death, thereby reducing the weight to be afforded to these factors. Accordingly, I afford these factors low weight.
31. The public interest will also be favoured where disclosure could reasonably be expected to allow or assist inquiry into possible deficiencies in the conduct of an agency.⁵⁰ I consider that disclosure of the Recordings would, to some degree, allow or assist inquiry into possible deficiencies in the conduct of QPS in terms of how it conducted the investigation into the applicant's brother's death. I afford this factor moderate weight.

⁴⁴ Defined in schedule 5 of the RTI Act and section 12 of the IP Act.

⁴⁵ Defined in schedule 5 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁶ Schedule 4, part 2, item 9 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁷ *WEU27L and Mackay Hospital and Health Service* [2017] QICmr 44 (11 September 2017).

⁴⁸ *OKP and Department of Communities* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 9 July 2009) and *G37 and Queensland Police Service* [2025] QICmr 58 (28 August 2025).

⁴⁹ Schedule 4, part 2, items 1, 3 and 11 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁰ Schedule 4, part 2, item 5 of the RTI Act.

32. I acknowledge that disclosing the Recordings could reasonably be expected to contribute to the administration of justice.⁵¹ In this matter, there is a completed coronial process which I understand the applicant is seeking to have reopened. While I accept that disclosure of the Recordings would provide the applicant with access to additional evidentiary material that he could include in any request he submitted to the Coroner, I do not consider there is sufficient information available to demonstrate that the Recordings, if disclosed, would contribute, beyond a limited degree, to the administration of justice. In the circumstances, I afford these factors low weight.
33. As noted above, an opposing eligible family member nondisclosure factor will apply where the information (1) relates to a person who has died and (2) the information would, if the person were alive, be their personal information.⁵² I have taken into account that the applicant is likely aware of the nature of his brother's medical conditions, his home environment and some of the circumstances surrounding his death from information he has obtained through other avenues and the information which QPS has disclosed through this process. I am satisfied that this information operates to reduce the weight to be applied to the eligible family member factor. However, despite the applicant's existing knowledge, I still consider that there would be a significant impact to his brother's right to privacy, if he were alive, given the highly sensitive nature of his brother's information.
34. The RTI Act recognises that disclosure of information could reasonably be expected to cause a public interest harm if it would disclose personal information of a person, whether living or dead.⁵³ As indicated above, the brother's information comprises recordings of him at the scene and recordings of his home environment at the time of his death. In relation to the recordings at the scene, the applicant's brother appears in a vulnerable state; in my view, such images are of an inherently personal and private nature which would lead to significant public interest harm if disclosed. Also, when applying the harm factor, it is relevant to consider that were information is released under the RTI Act is done so on the basis that there can be no control over or limitation placed on its further dissemination, and there are no legal mechanisms by which I can impose limits on the future use or dissemination of the material.⁵⁴ This is unlike a court which has powers to issue orders or directions controlling the use or dissemination of information. Taking this into account, I must afford this factor significant weight.
35. A further factor favouring nondisclosure arises if disclosing information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy.⁵⁵ The third-party information comprises other individuals' identifying information and information provided in the context of a QPS investigation into the death of the applicant's brother. I am satisfied the third-party information is highly personal and sensitive in nature, and I consider it is the type of information which those individuals are entitled to keep private. Its disclosure under the RTI Act would be an unwarranted intrusion into the privacy of these individuals and the extent of the public interest harm that could be anticipated from disclosure is significant. As a result, I afford each factor significant weight.
36. I also consider that disclosing the third-party information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the flow of information to police which gives rise to another factor favouring nondisclosure.⁵⁶ QPS investigators dealing with these types of matters rely on the free flow of information from witnesses and complainants. I consider that giving access to information they have provided under the RTI Act and outside of the investigation

⁵¹ Schedule 4, part 2, items 16 and 17 of the RTI Act.

⁵² Schedule 4, part 3, item 5 of the RTI Act.

⁵³ Schedule 4, part 4, item 6(1) of the RTI Act.

⁵⁴ *FLK v Information Commissioner* [2021] QCATA 46 at [17].

⁵⁵ Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁶ Schedule 4, part 3, item 13 of the RTI Act.

process would mean that witnesses or complainants would be less likely to provide that information to police in the future. I afford this factor significant weight in these circumstances.

37. In summary, I am satisfied there is a significant public interest in the applicant, as an eligible family member gaining access to information about his brother, and a moderate interest in promoting community wellbeing. I also accept that the public interest in enhancing QPS's accountability, assisting inquiry into possible deficiencies and the administration of justice are relevant in this case. However, I consider the public interest in protecting the personal information and privacy of other individuals, particularly the applicant's brother, and ensuring QPS's ability to obtain confidential information, carry significantly higher weight so as to favour nondisclosure. On balance, I find that the nondisclosure factors outweigh the disclosure factors and therefore, access to the Recordings may be refused under section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

Notebook Entries

38. An agency may delete information from a document which is irrelevant to the scope of an access application before releasing that document to the applicant.⁵⁷ This is not a ground for refusal of access but a mechanism to allow irrelevant information to be deleted from documents which are identified for release to an applicant. In deciding whether information is irrelevant, it is necessary to consider whether the information has any bearing upon, or is pertinent to, the terms of the application.⁵⁸
39. I have considered the Notebook Entries and am satisfied they contain details of other matters being dealt with by QPS unrelated to the applicant's brother or the investigation of his death. As the Notebook Entries do not relate to the matters the subject of the access application, I find they fall outside the terms of the application and were validly deleted from the documents released to the applicant under section 73 of the RTI Act.

DECISION

40. For the above reasons, I vary the reviewable decision⁵⁹ and find that:
- access to the Police Report may be refused under section 47(3)(a) of the RTI Act as it comprises exempt information under schedule 3, section 10(4) of the RTI Act
 - access to the Recordings may be refused under section 47(3)(b) as they comprise contrary to public interest information under section 49 of the RTI Act; and
 - the Notebook Entries may be deleted under section 73 of the RTI Act as they are not relevant to the terms of the access application.
41. I have made this decision as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 145 of the RTI Act.



K Shepherd
Assistant Information Commissioner

Date: 9 March 2026

⁵⁷ Section 73 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁸ *O80PCE and Department of Education and Training* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 15 February 2010) at [52].

⁵⁹ Under section 110(1)(b) of the RTI Act.