

Submission No: 1623

Date Received: 22-10-03

Forbes, Bev (REPS)

From: Grosse, Mikala (K. Hull, MP) on behalf of Hull, Kay (MP)
Sent: Wednesday, 22 October 2003 1:23 PM
To: Forbes, Bev (REPS)
Subject: FW: Some more Child Support Agency info for your Inquiry

24 OCT 2003

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 22 October 2003 1:19 PM
To: Hull, Kay (MP); Dutton, Peter (MP); Price, Roger (MP); Draper, Trish (MP)
Subject: Some more Child Support Agency info for your Inquiry

Dear committee members,
I have a problem with the CSA that you may be interested in. I have attached a document that I sent today to the CSA objection team.
Basically they are assessing me on a higher income than I actually earn. My issue is why do they insist your income must have dropped by at least 15% before they will accept a lower income estimate. They will accept higher ones with no problems (you don't even have to provide supporting evidence) but when your income drops you have to jump through hoops before they will reassess you. My case is genuine and I am not trying to avoid paying. I will pay the proper percentage when applied to my actual earnings. Now I fully understand why so many people complain about the CSA, and understand why so many men commit suicide as they see no other way out. This situation is ridiculous. Can you please ask the CSA why this is allowed to happen to innocent people like me? I can provide you with all the supporting documentation if necessary (pay slips etc...)

ps I also put in a submission to the inquiry. One thing I wish I had added in there is that when ex partners relocate for no good reason (other than to take the children away from the Dads and destroy their relationship) they should automatically go on a lower Child Support percentage that should be reviewed every year. Also if they repartner they should also go on a lower percentage, which will then allow the Dad to rebuild his life also. Maybe a 2 or even 3 tiered formula depending on relocations, repartnering etc etc could help.

Michael Keayes
Enterprise Capacity & Storage Services
[REDACTED]

Important: This e-mail is intended for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is confidential, commercially valuable or subject to legal or parliamentary privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that any review, re-transmission, disclosure, use or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited by several Commonwealth Acts of Parliament. If you have received this communication in error please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this transmission together with any attachments.

Ref number [REDACTED]
Attn Di Ross

Michael Keayes
4 Trussell place
Kambah
ACT 2902

I object to the Child Support Agency's decision to reject my latest estimate of income. I am not earning the amount you are assessing me on, and will not be earning that amount in the future.

History

Feb 2003 - assessment lodged against me based on 2001-2002 income of \$76404. This figure is composed of my base salary of around \$55000 and an additional 36% penalties for working shifts.

April 2003 - I was forced to leave my shift work position in order to be able to see my children. This was accepted by the CSA and a new estimate put in. (I think in the order of about \$56,000 - this amount is my base pay without any shift penalties)
My year to date earnings at this point in the year was \$61740 (as at 10/4/03)

Around August 2003 I put in a new estimate as I had started working on temporary (initially until December 2003) higher duties on a pay rate of \$62390. I put in an increased estimate which was annualised by the CSA and this too was accepted by the CSA.

My 2002-2003 tax return was recently put in showing 2002-2003 full year earnings of \$72315. The CSA has used this as the basis of my new assessment. The bulk of this money was earned while I was still a shift worker (as can be seen from my year to date earnings as at 10/4/03). I then put in another estimate on October 16th of \$62855. The CSA is now telling me that because this latest estimate is less than 15% less than my 2002-2003 tax return the estimate is rejected.

My objection.

I am not earning \$72315 and have no hope of earning that sort of money this year. My base salary at the moment is \$56000. I am on temporary higher duties at the pay rate of \$62390 and this is what I am earning. There is no assurance at all that these higher duties will continue. I realise the legislation sets down the 15% figure but surely my case clearly shows I am willing to pay the correct rate based on what I am actually earning.

If my assessment is made on the higher figure it will have an immediate and serious impact on me. I will no longer be able to make mortgage payments and will find it difficult to feed and clothe my children and myself.

I am also sending this letter to Federal Members of Parliament, the Chief Executive Officer of the CSA, the House of Reps Inquiry into Child Custody. I intend to take this matter up with the Commonwealth Ombudsman and the Administrative Appeals Tribunal .