

**STATE OF TASMANIA v CARLY LEE LOGAN, DAVID THOMAS SHEEHAN and
CONNOR SHANNON STRANGE**

4 JULY 2025

COMMENTS ON PASSING SENTENCE

JAGO J

Ms Logan, Mr Strange and Mr Sheehan, each of you has pleaded guilty to one count of assault. Whilst you are all charged on a single indictment, each of you is charged with an individual count, and the State do not allege that any of you are criminally responsible for the actions of the others.

The crimes of assault occurred on 25 June 2023, when all of you attended at the home of the complainant, Mark Richardson. Ms Logan and Mr Richardson had previously been in a relationship and shared custody of a child, whom I shall refer to as "B". In June 2023, Ms Logan and Mr Sheehan were in a relationship. Mr Strange is Ms Logan's older son.

On 25 June, B was spending time with Mr Richardson. Ms Logan became aware that B had had an argument with his father. Thereafter, there was an exchange of messages between Ms Logan and Mr Richardson. The tenor of those messages was that Ms Logan was concerned about how B was being treated. At one point, Ms Logan rang Mr Richardson and there was a tense exchange about B. Mr Richardson then went to work for a period. Whilst he was away, B rang Ms Logan and told her that he was locked in the bedroom, that he was not being fed and generally complained about the way in which he was being treated by his father. Thereafter, there was a further exchange of text messages in which both Mr Richardson and Ms Logan made disparaging and threatening comments. The subject of the messages was the care of B and discussion of an issue relating to the payment of B's school fees. It is obvious there was considerable angst and tension between Ms Logan and Mr Richardson and both of them behaved in an antagonising manner.

In the early afternoon, the three defendants drove to the complainant's house from their home in Devonport. When they arrived, Mr Richardson, having been alerted to the arrival of the three by B, went to the door. Ms Logan started punching him to the face. The complainant fell to the ground. At that point, Mr Strange, who was in possession of some form of bat, used it to push Mr Richardson in the ribs. He then punched him. Mr Sheehan, who was in possession of an 8-ball cue, struck Mr Richardson to the back of the leg with the cue. All three defendants then left with B. As they left, one of them smashed the windscreen of the complainant's vehicle. The complainant called triple zero, police attended. He was taken to hospital. He had pain to his ear and side of his head, with some lacerations. There was also pain and swelling to his calf. This was the most substantial of the injuries. It required treatment with a cast for a short period. All injuries resolved without residual damage. The three defendants were subsequently arrested, and all participated in records of interview with police.

Ms Logan told police that she received a message from B, asking that she collect him. He told her that Mr Richardson was getting angry and had locked him in his room and he was not allowed to eat. She messaged Mr Richardson to try and sort the issue out, but he became angry. The discussions became heated, and the complainant threatened her. She said it was in that context that she, Mr Sheehan and Mr Strange drove to Mr Richardson's home. She said she was going there to get B out of the house because she was concerned as to his welfare. She admitted she was very angry when she went to the house. She agreed that she had grabbed at Mr Richardson's face "pretty hard" and had squeezed it. She also agreed that at one point she had struck him with her fists.

Mr Strange told police that he had heard his mother speaking to B on the phone and that his brother was crying. He said he heard Mr Richardson threaten his mother on the phone. He agreed he had travelled to the complainant's home and had with him a cricket bat. He said when Ms Logan went to the door, he initially stayed back but as the altercation escalated, he ran over and hit the complainant to the ribs with the bat. He said that this strike was with a low level of force. The State accept this. He also admitted punching the complainant to the face "a couple of times".

Mr Sheehan told the police that he too had overheard the conversation between Ms Logan and the complainant and heard the complainant threaten Ms Logan. He travelled with the others to the complainant's home. He took with him an 8-ball cue for protection. Ms Logan went to the door initially and it was only when the confrontation escalated that he joined in. He said he struck the complainant to the back of his leg with the 8-ball cue, three to six times, using only a moderate degree of force. He said he went there to assist with retrieving B and only hit the complainant because he believed the complainant had hit B. He said he was remorseful for what occurred and did not intend for it to go that far.

Ms Logan is 46 years of age. She is employed. By way of prior conviction there is a very dated matter of common assault from 2013. She was not convicted of that matter, but it was dealt with by way of an undertaking. Other than that, she has no relevant prior convictions.

Mr Sheehan is 45 years of age. He has a number of prior convictions for driving offences, but no prior criminal history involving violence.

Mr Strange is 24 years of age. He has no relevant prior convictions.

The use of violence to settle any grievance is not acceptable, but here I note that emotions had become very heightened because of the suggestions B had made that he was not being properly cared for. There was also considerable tension between Ms Logan and Mr Richardson. Common sense tells me they each perceived the behaviour and reaction of the other in different ways, and in ways which supported their point of view. Ms Logan was obviously protective of her son and reacted in an angry and emotional manner to what she was told by B. Mr Strange and Mr Sheehan were protective of Ms Logan and were also caught up in the emotion of it all. The culmination of all that was that each of the defendants acted in a manner that was out of character for them.

That said, this is a serious incident. The complainant was confronted by three people, two of whom were wielding weapons. Each defendant is to be sentenced only for their role in the assault, but the fact that there were three of you would have undoubtedly increased the anxiety and fear for the complainant. There is no victim impact statement but, in the circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that he would have been concerned as to his safety.

I take into account the respective pleas of guilty. I also note the co-operation that each of you demonstrated with police. You told police about your involvement in this matter and much of what is asserted against you, arises from your own admissions.

In all the circumstances, I am of the view that a period of imprisonment is necessary to send a very clear message not only to you, but to others, that the use of violence in circumstances such as these is not acceptable. Whatever the difficulty, whatever your concerns may have been,

violence is not the answer. Whilst one can accept, you were upset about what may have been happening with your son, vigilante justice can never be accepted by the courts or the community. Courts need to adopt a stern approach in response to such unlawful behaviour because if such an approach is not adopted, acts of retribution can soon escalate out of control.

Because of that, imprisonment is necessary, but I take the view that the execution of the term in respect to each of you can be wholly suspended, given your lack of any recent relevant prior convictions and my satisfaction that this is an aberration arising from stressful circumstances and not reflective of a propensity towards violence generally held by any of you.

In my view, although each of you is charged individually, there is no reason to distinguish between the seriousness of your respective criminal behaviour and therefore no reason to distinguish in terms of the sentence imposed.

Ms Logan, Mr Strange, Mr Sheehan, in respect to each of you I impose a sentence of four months' imprisonment. The whole of that sentence will be suspended for a period of 18 months on condition that you are not to commit another offence punishable by imprisonment during that time. You should clearly understand that the law is that upon breach of a condition of a suspended sentence being proved, a judge must activate it and make you serve it unless it is unjust to do so. Therefore, if you wish to avoid serving the prison sentence I have just imposed, you all must strictly comply with the terms of its suspension.