



# **CORONERS COURT OF QUEENSLAND**

## **FINDINGS OF INQUEST**

**CITATION:** **Inquest into the death of Collin James Young**

**TITLE OF COURT:** Coroners Court

**JURISDICTION:** BRISBANE

**FILE NO(s):** 2021/2581

**DELIVERED ON:** 17 December 2025 (in chambers)

**DELIVERED AT:** Brisbane

**HEARING DATE(s):** Pre-inquest conference: 2 July 2025  
Inquest: 1 to 4 September 2025

**FINDINGS OF:** Megan Fairweather, Coroner

**CATCHWORDS:** Coroners: inquest, pedestrian collision

**REPRESENTATION:**

Counsel Assisting: Liam Dollar

Counsel for Senior Constable Barry Griffin: Rachel Tierney

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
Executive summary .....	3
Collin James Young .....	3
The inquest .....	4
What led Mr Young to being on the road on Friday night 11 June 2021? .....	5
Events leading up to 11 to 12 June 2021 .....	5
Initial scene investigation .....	6
Forensic pathologist report .....	7
What were the circumstances of Mr Young being struck by Mr Reiman's utility? .....	8
Identifying the vehicle and driver .....	8
Forensic engineering report .....	9
Witness evidence .....	10
Mr Riley Allan and Mr Jack Erskine (11.41pm) .....	10
Mr Patrick Ingram (11.45pm) .....	11
The Ford Convoy (11.53pm) .....	12
QPS response to the 000 call .....	12
Isaiah Reiman's four wheel drive group .....	13
Recollections of Mr Reiman's family members of their discussions over the weekend of 12 and 13 June 2021 .....	16
Recollections of Mr Reiman's four wheel drive group members over the weekend 11 to 12 June 2021 .....	20
Mr Reiman's recollections .....	22
Breathalyser data .....	23
Was Mr Reiman aware he had struck a person at the time of collision? .....	25
Reliability of Mr Reiman .....	25
Evidence about Mr Reiman's awareness of what happened .....	25
Was Mr Reiman distracted by the breathalyser? .....	26
Was Mr Reiman blowing into the breathalyser? .....	26
Vehicle speed and operation .....	27
Influence of drugs or alcohol .....	27
Could Mr Young's life have been saved with emergency treatment? .....	27
Did Mr Young intend for his life to end in this way? .....	28
Mr Young's state of mind .....	28
My Young's conduct .....	29
<i>Coroners Act 2003</i> section 45(2) findings .....	29
Identity of the deceased .....	29
How he died .....	29
Place of death .....	30
Date of death .....	30
Cause of death .....	30
Section 46 <i>Coroners Act 2003</i> comments and recommendations .....	30
Section 48 <i>Coroners Act 2003</i> referrals of offences or misconduct .....	30
Conclusion .....	31

## Introduction

1. Collin Young was born on 10 November 1975. He died tragically, aged 45 years, after being struck by a motor vehicle between 11 and 12 June 2021.
2. At about 7.00am on Saturday, 12 June 2021, two cyclists found Mr Young's body in a ditch near the intersection of Beerburrum and Porter Roads in Caboolture. They immediately called triple zero. Queensland Ambulance Service officers were on scene very quickly. Sadly, there was nothing they could do. Mr Young was clearly passed away with catastrophic trauma injuries.
3. Mr Young's death was reported to the Coroners Court of Queensland for investigation under the *Coroners Act 2003*. The purpose of a coronial investigation is to establish certain facts, namely, the identity of the person who died, when, where and how they died, and their medical cause of death. An investigation can also examine systemic failures that may have contributed to a death and make recommendations to help prevent future deaths.
4. There are clear answers as to Mr Young's identity, when and where he died, and his medical cause of death. He died near the intersection of Beerburrum Road and Porter Road in Caboolture, between late 11 June 2021 and early 12 June 2021. A forensic pathologist advised he died from multiple injuries sustained as a pedestrian in a motor vehicle collision.
5. A Queensland Police Service investigation identified Mr Young was struck by a Toyota four wheel drive utility driven by Mr Isaiah Reiman. Mr Reiman was eventually charged with manslaughter and with failing to remain at, or near, the scene and exhibit proper respect for the body of Mr Young, and showing callous disregard.<sup>1</sup> Mr Reiman did not participate in an interview with police. For the manslaughter charge, a committal with cross examination occurred over two days. Mr Reiman did not give evidence at the committal.
6. On 14 November 2023, a Magistrate found there was insufficient evidence of any unlawfulness to commit Mr Reiman for an indictable offence. On 7 March 2024, the summary charge was dismissed after police offered no evidence. To have been successful, police would need to have demonstrated, beyond reasonable doubt, that the driver was aware at the time he had struck a person.
7. Mr Reiman had not previously given an account to authorities about what occurred on the night of Mr Young's death. Despite the police investigation and the committal proceedings, there remained unanswered questions:
  - a. What led Mr Young to being on the road on Friday night 11 June 2021?
  - b. What were the circumstances of him being struck by Mr Reiman's utility?
  - c. Was Mr Reiman aware he had struck a person at the time of collision?
  - d. Could Mr Young's life have been saved with emergency treatment?
  - e. Did Mr Young intend for his life to be ended in this way?

<sup>1</sup> Respectively, section 310 *Criminal Code* and section 92 *Transport Operations Road Use Management Act 2003*.

8. An inquest was convened to inquire into these matters.

## **Executive summary**

9. On the evening of 11 June 2021, Mr Young argued with his wife. At around 11.15pm he left their home on foot. Several road users saw him standing near the middle of nearby Beerburrum Road, in an area dimly lit by a single streetlight and posted as a 100km/h zone. Mr Young was wearing dark clothing, likely with his hoodie on, and playing loud music through headphones. The music was audible when the headphones were found the next morning.
10. Mr Young was struck by a four wheel drive Toyota utility driven by Mr Isaiah Reiman between 11.40pm and midnight. Mr Reiman's evidence about the event is unreliable. He said he did not recall anything much. The evidence from his family and friends raised the possibility Mr Reiman was distracted by beeping from his breathalyser, or had bent to take a test, while driving at speed along Beerburrum Road. His family and friends recall him saying he thought he hit a kangaroo. I cannot make any findings to the necessary standard of proof about these matters.
11. There is insufficient evidence to find Mr Reiman was aware he struck a person.
12. The force of the strike caused such catastrophic injuries that Mr Young's death would have occurred within seconds to minutes, 10 at most. Even if emergency services were called, his life could not have been saved.
13. There is insufficient evidence to find Mr Young intended his life to end in this way.

## **Collin James Young**

14. Collin James Young was born on 10 November 1975. He and his partner of six and half years, Claire Lees, had just married on 10 April 2021. Ms Lees described their relationship was very good. Like any couple, they could have words or disagreements but could generally talk things through.
15. The couple had recently bought a house in Woodford and were planning to move there on 1 July 2021. Mr Young started his own transport and logistics business in 2014 which had grown to employ about 15 people. He worked long hours for its success, no doubt to build a better life for his family.
16. Mr Young had two daughters, Annaleese (Annie) and Jazmine. Annie had recently moved in with Mr Young and Ms Lees. He was also a stepfather to Christianne and Caycie. Mr Young also had two sisters, Renee and Katrina, and a younger brother, Richard. Mr Young was very close to his siblings.
17. A family statement was read during the inquest. It was a powerful reminder of Mr Young's humanity. It demonstrated his family's deep grief and the loss they have endured since his death. The family explained the difference Mr Young had made through the way he loved, supported, protected, and showed up for others. He was deeply loved and admired and the heart and soul of his family. He was a tender hearted husband to Claire, and a wonderful dad and stepdad and brother. He loved with all his heart. He loved making people laugh. He was the family's 'safe place', and a reliable friend. He is remembered for laughing around a campfire, his voice filling his family with a warm, familiar joy.

18. Mr Young's family and friends attended the inquest and demonstrated great strength and integrity throughout the hearings.

## **The inquest**

19. The inquest was held over four days between 1 and 4 September 2025. A pre-inquest conference on 2 July 2025 set the issue for inquest as: *The findings required by section 45(2) of the Coroners Act 2003; namely the identity of the deceased, when, where, and how he died and what caused his death.*
20. An extensive coronial brief of evidence was prepared, and further coronial investigations were conducted including independent expert evidence from a forensic mechanical engineer and an emergency physician. Oral evidence was heard from the following 21 witnesses:
  - a. Dr Nadine Forde (forensic pathologist)
  - b. Dr Benjamin Close (Senior Staff Specialist in Emergency Medicine)
  - c. Senior Constable Barry Griffin (Forensic Crash Unit)
  - d. Dr Paul Carnavas (forensic mechanical engineer)
  - e. Erin Laws (Guardian Interlock Systems)
  - f. Riley Allan
  - g. Jack Erskine
  - h. Patrick Ingram
  - i. Christopher Palin
  - j. James Watson
  - k. Marra Palin
  - l. Ben Flanagan
  - m. Jayden Proctor
  - n. Andrew Roughsedge
  - o. Cameron Sharp
  - p. Lachlan Smith
  - q. Oliver Carey
  - r. Tyrone Reiman
  - s. Wayne O'Shanesy
  - t. Bridget Reiman
  - u. Isaiah Reiman.

21. In preparing these findings, I have had regard to submissions of Counsel Assisting and from the legal representative of the investigating police officer, Senior Constable Barry Griffin, as well as the hearing transcripts.
22. It is important to remember that an inquest is not a trial. It is not a Coroner's role to cast blame or determine criminal or civil liability.<sup>2</sup>
23. The task of making findings in this matter has been complicated by differing witness recollections, inconsistencies in what some witnesses have said on different occasions, and the passage of time. A decline in the quality of evidence is expected given the time elapsed and the traumatic nature of the events.
24. The standard of proof for Coroner's findings is the balance of probabilities in accordance with the sliding scale of satisfaction explained in *Briginshaw v Briginshaw*.<sup>3</sup> When considering whether to make an adverse finding against a person, the evidence required to prove the facts supporting any such finding needs to be commensurate with the gravity of the proposed finding.
25. All evidence must be considered carefully, but it is necessary only to refer to evidence to the extent necessary to provide reasons for any findings. It is not necessary to resolve every difference in witness recollection to make the findings required by section 45(2) of the *Coroners Act 2003*.

## **What led Mr Young to being on the road on Friday night 11 June 2021?**

### **Events leading up to 11 to 12 June 2021**

26. In the week before his death, Mr Young drove to Sydney and back. He got home at about 6.30pm on Friday 11 June 2021. There were some tensions about plans for an upcoming event. Ms Lees and Mr Young then talked about dinner which Ms Lees prepared. She did not ultimately eat. It is not known if Mr Young ate.
27. Mr Young had been messaging on his phone. He and Ms Lees sat outside talking and having a few drinks. Mr Young had a couple of phone calls with his sister Katrina, including about their mother's medical issues and an upcoming medical appointment. Mr Young was unsure whether he should attend. Ms Lees recalled advising Mr Young not to attend, he could let Katrina go alone.
28. Later that night, Mr Young got angry about this conversation. He interpreted Ms Lees as saying he was not fit to look after his mother. He raised his voice, not shouting but speaking louder than usual. The conversation was out of character. Ms Lees put it down to tiredness and drinking alcohol. She went upstairs to shower and go to bed. After exchanging some text messages, Ms Lees went back downstairs. She kissed Mr Young on the head and asked him to come to bed. He refused and swore at her.
29. In the text messages, Mr Young accused Ms Lees of telling him he was not the person to deal with his mother. Ms Lees tried to explain that is not what she had said. Mr Young told her to take their bank savings as he did not care anymore. He indicated they had a good marriage until that night. He called her a derogatory name and swore at her. This was all out of character. She told him to listen to himself and go to bed. She sent a message suggesting "he had added 2 and 2 and got 46", followed by beer

<sup>2</sup> Section 45(5) *Coroners Act 2003*.

<sup>3</sup> See for example *Hurley v Clements & Ors* [2010] 1 Qd R 215; [2009] QCA 167at [25].

and facepalm emojis. It can be inferred Ms Lees meant to convey he was misconstruing things due to drinking. The last message she sent wished him good night and said that she loved him.

30. At around 4.00am on 12 June 2021, Ms Lees woke up and noticed Mr Young was not in bed. She checked her phone to see where his phone pinged. She did not see it, so thought he must be nearby. She looked inside and outside but could not find him. She checked their CCTV and saw, according to the time stamp, he had walked out of the property at about 11.15pm the night before. Mr Young was wearing thongs, long pants, and a long-sleeved top with a hood. He walked across the grass, down the driveway towards the road, before disappearing from view. His manner of walking, in combination with other evidence, suggests he was intoxicated, at least to some extent.
31. Ms Lees tried to call him, but he did not answer. She assumed he was with family or friends. As it was so early, she went back to bed before, at around 5.30am, starting to call around to ask where he was. No one had seen him.
32. In the meantime, at around 7.00am, two cyclists riding along Beerburrum Road towards the intersection with Porter Road saw what appeared to be a body in a ditch on the side of the road. They immediately stopped and rang triple zero. Queensland Ambulance Service paramedics were on scene by 7.12am. They assessed the body and declared the male person, Mr Young, to be deceased.
33. Police officers established a crime scene and police from the Forensic Crash Unit, Scenes of Crime and Criminal Investigation Branch came to investigate.
34. Shortly after 8.00am, Ms Lees was informed of a fatal traffic crash on Beerburrum Road. She drove to the Porter Road intersection and noticed the emergency services. She informed police about Mr Young not returning home.

### **Initial scene investigation**

35. Forensic Crash Investigator, Senior Constable Barry Griffin, conducted a scene examination on the morning of 12 June 2021. His key findings were as follows.
36. The intersection of Beerburrum Road and Porter Road is a T-intersection not controlled by traffic lights. Beerburrum Road is bitumen surface with two lanes for travel north and south. The speed limit is 100km/h. There is localised widening at the intersection to provide passing space for through traffic if a vehicle is turning into Porter Road. The road was in good condition at the time. An overhead streetlight at the intersection provided limited lighting.
37. Mr Young's body was found lying in a table drain along the western side of Beerburrum Road. He was in 10cm of muddy water, about 60 metres south of the Porter Road intersection. Mr Young had sustained obvious severe injuries. His clothing was partially removed and consisted of black thermal underwear, blue track pants, a grey jumper and blue jacket with bare feet.
38. Senior Constable Griffin identified a clear slide mark in the grass leading from Mr Young's body back to Beerburrum Road. This mark continued along the road surface towards the intersection of Porter Road for about 45 metres, to a large blood stain on the road surface. The blood stain was on the western side edge of the northbound lane, forming part of the exit lane for northbound traffic to turn left into Porter Road. From this point, there was a splatter of mud debris across the northbound lane, with biological matter, glass and plastic debris. One piece of plastic debris had the word 'Toyota' inscribed on it.

39. The blood stain on the road indicated the approximate point of impact where Mr Young was likely struck by a then unknown vehicle. It was difficult to provide a definitive impact point, but it was around the centre line, within a one metre margin of error, meaning it was possibly in either the southbound or northbound lane. The field of debris commenced in line with the streetlight, travelling south for about 20 metres, indicating the impact was to the north of this location.
40. A mobile telephone and headphones were found on the grass verge around 25 metres from Mr Young's body. Loud music was emanating from the headphones. Two black rubber thongs were on the eastern side of Beerburrum Road. There were no tyre marks connected to the incident on the road or surrounding grass. There was nothing to suggest Mr Young's body had been moved.
41. Looking back from the blood stain on the roadway, there was a clear line to Mr Young's final resting position. Senior Constable Griffin measured this was about 60 to 65 metres, but was aware Dr Paul Carnavas, Forensic Engineer, had calculated the distance in the range of 55 metres. Senior Constable Griffin conceded the placement of pins on the satellite image used in his report was not intended to be to scale and perhaps required some small adjustments.
42. Senior Constable Griffin considered pedestrian projection of 55 to 65 metres was consistent with a car travelling in a speed range of about 90km/h up to about 105km/h or 109km/h. He explained that collisions of this type are dynamic events, impacted by frictions of the objects involved. It is difficult to be precise about the distance of pedestrian travel in any particular scenario. The drain would have had an arresting effect on the distance travelled.
43. Senior Constable Griffin determined the vehicle involved was likely a four wheel drive with mud underneath it. There was mud debris on the road in the vicinity of the plastic and glass debris in a pattern consistent with an impact. This section of road was close to the Beerburrum State Forest, commonly used by four wheel drive enthusiasts. The vehicle was likely to be high based on the trajectory involved. He advised Criminal Investigation Branch police officers they should be looking for a Toyota, possibly a Landcruiser or Hilux.
44. There was no evidence Mr Young was runover on the bitumen surface and there was nothing to indicate Mr Young was struck by more than one vehicle.

### **Forensic pathologist report**

45. Dr Nadine Forde, forensic pathologist, conducted a postmortem examination and prepared an autopsy report and gave evidence at the inquest.
46. Dr Forde determined the cause of death was multiple injuries, due to, or as a consequence of motor vehicle collision (pedestrian). Mr Young's death would have occurred almost immediately due to severe and extensive injuries.
47. Dr Forde advised the extensive injuries sustained by Mr Young were in keeping with being struck by a vehicle. While her report noted potential for an element of overrun, this was without knowing all the circumstances. She agreed the severity of Mr Young's injuries could have been caused without runover.
48. Toxicology testing detected alcohol in Mr Young's blood sample (0.109%) and eye fluid sample (0.135%) but no other drugs. Dr Forde was unable to advise about the specific effects of alcohol on Mr Young, emphasising it would depend on individual factors such as tolerance, body habitus and general health. She referred to the

Handbook of Forensic Toxicology for Medical Examiners which advised blood alcohol content findings had included:

- a. 0.05%: less alert with impaired coordination.
  - b. 0.08 to 0.1%: impaired coordination and judgment, decreased reaction time, loss of concentration, emotional instability.
  - c. 0.1 to 0.2%: disorientation, decreased balance and gait functioning, slurred speech, poor sensory perception, confusion.
49. Dr Forde was of the view that decision making, perception of risk and risk tolerance would probably all fall within impaired judgment.
50. Dr Forde advised it was very difficult to determine the direction in which Mr Young was struck, and could not say confidently, with certainty or probability, whether he was struck from the rear, the front, or laterally.<sup>4</sup>

## **What were the circumstances of Mr Young being struck by Mr Reiman's utility?**

### **Identifying the vehicle and driver**

51. Police investigations, through social media, traffic cameras, and speaking to other road users out late on 11 June 2021, led to the discovery and seizure of a Toyota Landcruiser utility, DU4L80, registered to Mr Isaiah Reiman.
52. The utility was located on Sunday 13 June 2021 in the front driveway of Mr Reiman's home address. It was visible from the street, not concealed in any manner, and not washed. The bullbar was pushed back on the driver's side and the driver's side bonnet was crumpled. The driver's side headlight covers were smashed, and front tyre completely flat. There was suspected biological matter or blood within and around the driver's side headlight casing. The word 'Toyota' on the intact headlight seemed consistent with the plastic found at the scene.
53. The vehicle was towed for police forensic examination which occurred on 14 June 2021. It was covered in mud. Biological samples were taken for testing. There was nothing of note on the undercarriage.
54. On 29 June 2021, a police vehicle inspection officer concluded the Toyota was in a potentially dangerous mechanical condition due to an inoperative park brake assembly, but there were no defects found to be contributory to the incident.
55. Senior Constable Griffin also inspected the vehicle on 7 July 2021. He noted a white bullbar with two large driving lights attached, as well as a light bar across the front. Senior Constable Griffin considered the front right sided damage was consistent with a "Rotating Forward Trajectory Pedestrian Strike", typical when a pedestrian is struck around the centre of mass, causing a slight rotation, with bonnet strike, and then propelled away from the vehicle. The line markings within the left indicator lens and headlight glass appeared consistent with crash scene debris. There were no signs of runover.

<sup>4</sup> Senior Constable Griffin concluded Mr Young was likely standing when he was struck, but did not see anything at the scene that allowed a definitive view of which way he was facing.

56. A scientist from Queensland Health Forensic and Scientific Services analysed a reference sample of Mr Young's DNA and compared it to swabs taken from the vehicle. Each had a single contributor DNA profile matching to Mr Young.

### **Forensic engineering report**

57. Dr Paul Carnavas, Forensic Engineer, was engaged to provide analysis and expert opinion on several aspects of the investigation into Mr Young's death.
58. Dr Carnavas prepared two reports, dated 28 March 2025 and 24 April 2025 and gave oral evidence at the inquest. He advised the vehicle damage that could be associated with pedestrian impact as including:
- a. The front right bullbar was forced back into the bonnet and front guard.
  - b. The right headlights and side marker light were smashed and the indicator frame below the headlights was displaced and partially protruding forwards.
  - c. The right side bonnet was severely dented, consistent with heavy impact from above.
  - d. The right side front guard was displaced rearwards. Dr Carnavas noted this did not appear to be the original front guard and its abnormal position (and/or some of the damage) may have predated the incident.
59. Dr Carnavas explained that, generally speaking, the trajectory of a pedestrian after frontal vehicle collision depends on the position of the person's centre of gravity relative to the application point of the vehicle impact force. This determines whether the impact kinematics can be classified as either a 'wrap', 'forward' or 'combination' projection.
60. Dr Carnavas concluded the leading edge of the Toyota was just below Mr Young's standing upright centre of gravity, indicating a probable 'combination' pedestrian projection. A 'combination' projection is when the bonnet leading edge height is just below the body centre of gravity height, with the resulting kinematics appearing as a 'combination' of 'wrap' and 'forward' projection.
61. The Toyota leading edge headlight was close to the height of Mr Young's left femoral fracture, but Dr Carnavas could not say with any certainty which way he was facing at the moment of collision.
62. Dr Carnavas concluded Mr Young's probable trajectory from a 'combination' projection from the Toyota would have included, in chronological order:
- a. Impact of the thigh/s and pelvis by the right front corner leading edge of the Toyota (the portion of bullbar in front of the right headlamp), with the most significant impact forces experienced by the body side facing the vehicle.
  - b. The body would have been lifted slightly and 'wrapped' around the nose of the Toyota with torso and probably arms and head impacting the bonnet.
  - c. Because the impact force was applied close to the body's centre of gravity, the body would not have substantively rotated by impact, nor lifted onto the windscreen, but would have remained 'caught up' at the front of the Toyota.

- d. Mr Young would have been carried on the offside front corner of the Toyota for some metres forward from the point of impact.
  - e. After the effects of the initial impact acceleration between the Toyota and Mr Young subsided, he would have started to slip off to the side of the Toyota.
  - f. Hitting the road at speed, Mr Young would have tumbled/travelled diagonally along and across the roadway and grassed verge, coming to rest in the drain.
63. At this point, it is important to mention that Senior Constable Griffin was in complete agreement with this analysis. Senior Constable Griffin confirmed he had reviewed Dr Carnavas' reports, and agreed with the contents and opinions.
64. Dr Carnavas concluded the final resting location of Mr Young, relative to the indicted point of impact was consistent with him being struck by the Toyota at close to 100km/h. Dr Carnavas explained the expected projection distance was close to 60 metres with a vehicle impact velocity of 100k/h. As Mr Young came to rest in the drain, the projection was most probably truncated. Dr Carnavas could not determine the precise speed of the utility at the moment of impact from projection distance alone, but considered it close to 100km/h.
65. Based on the location of the roadway markings, Dr Carnavas considered that:
- a. Mr Young was carried by the vehicle for about 17 metres after impact before falling to the road. For a vehicle travelling 100km/hour, which is in the vicinity of around 27 to 28 metres per second, this would have taken just over half a second.
  - b. Mr Young tumbled or slid across the bitumen for about 19 metres and then tumbled or slid across the grassed verge for a further 19 metres or so.
66. Dr Carnavas considered the overall linear trajectory from initial impact to rest was consistent with being caused by vehicle impact alone. There was no evidence of overrun. He would expect a shorter projection distance with overrun, and the linear markings at the scene were consistent with there being no overrun. There was no sign of overrun on the undercarriage of the vehicle.
67. Dr Carnavas, while not a medical doctor, restricted his interpretation of injuries to the types of forces applied. Mr Young's injuries were consistent with high speed impact by the Toyota, to the frontal aspect of his left side, and the sequence of events described in paragraph 62 above. He noted injuries in high speed impacts are so significant it becomes difficult to attribute them to individual impacts (such as initial impact, bonnet impact, ground impact) unless there is a standout feature. He did not see evidence to suggest Mr Young was struck by more than one vehicle and it was improbable that his body had been moved.

### **Witness evidence**

68. All witnesses who saw a person standing on the road in the late evening of 11 June 2021 were called to give evidence at the inquest. A number of other witnesses who had sufficient connection to the events also gave evidence.

### **Mr Riley Allan and Mr Jack Erskine (11.41pm)**

69. Mr Riley Allan and Mr Jack Erskine had been four wheel driving in Mr Allan's Nissan Patrol in the Glass House Mountains from about 7.00pm on 11 June 2021. At about 11.00pm, they left and travelled south along Beerburrum Road.

70. They both recalled seeing a man standing on Beerburrum Road as they passed through the intersection of Porter Road. They made three passes.
71. Mr Allan described the first pass. He had just overtaken a car and activated his spotlights when immediately he saw a person standing, not moving, in the middle of the road, one foot either side of the centre line. The person was wearing dark blue tracksuit pants and a grey or blue hoodie with the hood on, facing towards their vehicle. Mr Allan did not think he would have seen the person if he had not activated his spotlights. He estimated he was travelling at about 100km/hour at the time. Mr Allan swerved to the left of the man to avoid a collision. He thought he would have hit the man if he did not swerve.
72. Mr Allan performed a U-turn and drove past the man again, heading north at a much slower speed of 10 to 15 km/h. The man was in the same spot but had turned to face south. He still had his hood on and was smiling.
73. After another U-turn, they passed the man a third time. Mr Erskine filmed this pass on his phone. The video, taken at 11.41pm, was played in the inquest. It captured the man, standing still, on the centre line of the road, with his hood up. He was facing north. Mr Erskine yelled out, including to say get off the road.
74. Mr Erskine gave a similar account with a few relatively minor differences. He also recalled the man was standing on the centre line, but accepted he had previously said (at the committal) the man was standing in the middle of the southbound lane. Mr Erskine thought they had passed on the right of him on the first pass (rather than to the left). Mr Erskine struggled to recall which way the man was facing, initially saying he was facing towards Porter Road on each pass, but accepting he had said (at the committal) the man was facing north. Upon being shown his video of the third pass, Mr Erskine said the man was facing north the whole time. Mr Erskine was confident of the time he took the video as he had checked it on his phone when he prepared his statement.

### **Mr Patrick Ingram (11.45pm)**

75. Mr Patrick Ingram, a taxi driver, was driving home after finishing work in Maleny at 11.00pm. He stopped briefly at a service station before continuing down Beerburrum Road. As he approached the intersection of Porter Road, a vehicle was coming from the other direction, so he dimmed his spotlights. At that point, he saw a figure on the road. He initially thought it was a kangaroo, explaining he had seen kangaroos on Beerburrum Road previously.
76. On getting closer, and flicking his spotlights back on, Mr Ingram realised it was a person, walking northbound on the white centre line. The person stumbled and appeared intoxicated. Mr Ingram described the person wearing blue jeans, a blue T-shirt, with a bald head and no hat or hoodie.
77. Mr Ingram said he slowed his vehicle to about 40km/h and swerved to the left into a bus lane (a bitumen widening of the road) to safely pass the person. He believed there was sufficient room in the lane of travel to pass without striking the person, but he took the safer option of giving a wide berth.
78. Mr Ingram estimated seeing the person at around 11.45pm. He was confident of the timing as he left work at 11.00pm, it took 45 minutes to get home, but he had stopped to get a drink. He had checked his phone when he got home, at 11.50pm, which was about five minutes after seeing the man.

## **The Ford Convoy (11.53pm)**

79. A group of six friends, Christopher Palin, James Watson, Andrew Roughsedge, Jayden Proctor, Marra Palin, and Ben Flanagan, were driving three Ford AU Falcons on the evening of 11 June 2021. Their route included Mount Mee, Glass House Mountains, Beerburrum Road, ending at a carwash in Caboolture.
80. Mr Palin and Mr Watson were in a white Ford AU Falcon. Mr Palin was driving. They both recalled a man standing on Beerburrum Road as they passed the Porter Road intersection. They were the first in their group to pass this area.
81. Mr Palin described seeing a figure in the middle of the road, on the double white line. He realised it was a person when they were about 50 meters away. The person was standing completely still, facing towards the train tracks. He rotated his head slightly to watch them pass. The person was wearing a light-blue hoodie with the hood up and grey track pants. Mr Palin swerved to the left to avoid him. Mr Palin noticed a vehicle travelling behind him, believed to be a grey dual cab Ford Ranger, perform the same swerve manoeuvre. That vehicle continued behind them and passed the carwash shortly after Mr Palin had pulled in there.
82. Telephone calls were made from Mr Palin's car to other members of their convoy, to warn of the presence of the man on the road. Mr Watson called Ms Palin's phone at 11.53pm on 11 June 2021. Mr Flanagan answered because Ms Palin was driving. The call lasted 43 seconds, confirmed by call logs.
83. The vehicle occupied by Jayden Proctor and Andrew Roughsedge also received a warning call. Mr Proctor recalled receiving the call from Mr Palin. He was driving so he handed the phone to Mr Roughsedge, who put it on loudspeaker. They both recalled being told to the effect there was a guy walking in the middle of the road, to be careful, they had almost hit him.
84. Mr Proctor and Mr Roughsedge both said they did not see anyone on or near Beerburrum Road as they drove through the area shortly after. Ms Palin and Mr Flanagan also did not see anyone on Beerburrum Road as they passed through.
85. The Ford convoy group met at the Caboolture Car Wash. Traffic camera footage shows Mr Palin and Mr Watson's vehicle turning into the carwash a few seconds before 11.55pm on 11 June 2021. Mr Watson tried to call the Caboolture Police Station to make a report. He was on hold for around four minutes before, at 11.59pm, calling 000. The 000 recording was played in the inquest.
86. The two other Fords in the convoy were seen in the footage entering the carwash within 15 seconds after midnight, on 12 June 2021. Mr Watson recalled he was still on the phone to police when the others arrived.

## **QPS response to the 000 call**

87. Queensland Police Service provided evidence about their response to the 000 call. The 000 call was logged at 11.59.44pm, 11 June 2021. An operator took the call, and logged an incident, by 00.03am, 12 June 2021. Police patrolled from 00.09am to 00.20am. They travelled north on Beerburrum Road to the intersection of Porter Road and returned south. No person was located.
88. Despite the timely response by police, there is sufficient evidence to find that Mr Young had certainly been struck by this time, with his body resting away from the roadside in a drain to explain why he was not seen by the responding police officers.

## **Isaiah Reiman's four wheel drive group**

89. The final group of four wheel drivers in the area of the Glass House Mountains on the evening of 11 June 2021 included as follows:
  - a. Mr Oliver Carey on his own in his grey Nissan Navara dual cab.
  - b. Mr Isaiah Reiman with his dog but no other passengers in his white Toyota Landcruiser utility with a black tray, canopy, and bullbar.
  - c. Mr Cameron Sharp with his girlfriend in his 'comp' style white Nissan Patrol utility, with shortened tray. The vehicle was lifted.
  - d. Mr Lachlan Smith with a number of family members in his Nissan Patrol.
90. Mr Reiman arrived at the 'Big Red Carpark', the start of a track in the Glass House Mountains, at about 8.17pm where he met up with the occupants of the other three cars. After the four wheel driving, the group (or most of them) returned to the carpark. The group (or most of them) drove along Beerburrum-Woodford Road before stopping at the intersection of Beerburrum Road, where they said their goodbyes. Mr Watson and Mr Palin, from the Ford Convoy, had also waited for members of their group here, recalling they had seen some other four wheel drives.
91. There is sufficient evidence to conclude that Mr Watson and Mr Palin left the intersection first, followed by Mr Carey. Mr Carey was the first of Mr Reiman's group to leave the intersection, but the order of the remaining vehicles is unclear due to differing recollections. It seems likely Mr Reiman went next.

### ***Mr Carey's account of travelling down Beerburrum Road***

92. Mr Carey recalls following a white Ford Falcon to turn south on Beerburrum Road. He caught up to the Ford Falcon at around Elimbah and from that point, remained behind it, past the showgrounds to the D'Aguilar Highway area. He did not notice any vehicles behind him.
93. Mr Carey recalled seeing the Ford Falcon swerve to the left as it went past the intersection at Porter Road. He believed the Ford Falcon was about 100 metres in front of him. He could not see why it swerved at that moment.
94. As Mr Carey approached the intersection with Porter Road, he saw a dark figure on the road but did not immediately recognise it was a person. He swerved at the last second when he realised it was. Mr Carey accepted his statement to police was that "*He was facing towards me as I approached and had his hood on and head down*". He could not recall these matters at the inquest. Mr Carey accepted this was his recollection in 2021, and said he told the police the truth.
95. Mr Carey said that the figure did not move as he approached and had not moved when he looked in the rear vision mirror after passing him.
96. Mr Carey initially said in evidence the man was standing on the centre line but clarified the man was in the southbound lane but very close to the centre line. Mr Carey believed he would have hit the person had he not swerved. He did not stop but continued behind the Ford Falcon until it pulled into a carwash at Caboolture. He still did not notice any vehicle following him in the rear mirror.

97. During oral evidence at the inquest, Mr Carey was shown footage of Mr Palin's white Ford Falcon pulling into the carwash shortly before 11.55pm. In that footage, a large darker vehicle can be seen travelling behind Mr Palin's car. Mr Carey accepted that the darker vehicle in the footage was his.
98. Mr Carey was shown further footage of his route home, continuing down Beerburrum Road. Mr Carey was able to identify his vehicle and Mr Sharp's vehicle in that footage. Mr Carey said he did not have contact with Mr Reiman that evening after leaving the intersection of Beerburrum-Woodford Road.

***Mr Sharp's account of travelling down Beerburrum Road***

99. Mr Sharp stated to police that, from the intersection of Beerburrum-Woodford Road, he saw Mr Carey turn into Beerburrum Road towards Caboolture, and 'Izzy' drove off straight after. He did not see them again that night.
100. During his inquest evidence, Mr Sharp could not recall how long he remained at the intersection and could not recall whether Mr Smith was at the intersection.
101. Mr Sharp stated that, when travelling south down Beerburrum Road, he had his spotlight bar on, but did not see any person on the road or anything unusual as he passed Porter Road. He remembered talking to his girlfriend, but nothing else significant. Mr Sharp's account is supported by his girlfriend's statement.
102. Mr Sharp was able to identify, from the traffic camera footage, Mr Carey's car going past the carwash at Caboolture, and his own car coming past shortly after at about 11.57pm. Mr Sharp said he did not have any further conversations with Mr Reiman, Mr Smith, or Mr Carey that night.

***Mr Smith's account of travelling down Beerburrum Road***

103. Mr Smith stated to police he recalled by the time he got back to the Big Red Carpark, the others were 'long gone'.
104. Mr Smith's statement did not detail whether he stopped at the Beerburrum-Woodford Road intersection with Beerburrum Road. At the inquest, Mr Smith had no recollection of seeing anyone at the intersection and could not remember if he stopped there. He confirmed he travelled along Beerburrum Road past the Porter Road intersection. He did not see a person standing on the road, or a vehicle stopped, or anything out of the ordinary. Mr Smith's account was generally supported by the evidence from his passengers.

***Mr Reiman's account of travelling down Beerburrum Road***

105. Mr Reiman was called to give evidence at the inquest. He was warned about his right to claim privilege against self-incrimination but elected to give evidence without making a such a claim.
106. Mr Reiman was asked about the order the vehicles left the Beerburrum-Woodford Road intersection. He thought Mr Sharp and Mr Carey were in front of him but was not sure of their order. He believed he was the last of the three, and Mr Smith and his family were behind him having stopped for a time.<sup>5</sup> He said the first three vehicles of his four wheel drive group took off from the Beerburrum-Woodford Road intersection

<sup>5</sup> Mr Reiman accepted he could have been wrong about Mr Smith being at the intersection but he was pretty sure he was there.

together. He was able to see the other cars in front of him the whole way down. There were no big gaps.

107. Mr Reiman confirmed he was involved in a collision on Friday 11 June 2021. He accepted the point of collision was the intersection of Beerburrum and Porter Road. He had since avoided going back to the area. Mr Reiman also accepted he must have been the driver of the vehicle that struck Mr Young, although he maintained he was not aware then he had struck a person. He did not see what he hit. There had been a loud bang, but his memory was very vague.
108. In the moments before the collision, Mr Reiman did not think he was doing anything but driving. He said there would be no reason not to be looking at the road, but he did not remember now exactly where he was looking. He believed he was looking ahead at the road, but it was a long time ago and his memory was vague. He said he had been watching the road the whole night.
109. Mr Reiman was pressed about whether he saw what he collided with. It was suggested he must have seen what he collided with because the impact was directly in front of the driver's seat. He maintained he did not see what he collided with stating *"I've told you multiple times, I did not see Mr Young, I can keep telling you again and again if you want."* It is noted Mr Reiman's vehicle when seized by police showed some mud smear on the driver's side windscreen.
110. After realising something had happened, Mr Reiman said he stopped his car and got out, leaving the car idling on the road while he walked back, using the torch on his phone to look. He did not leave the road when looking. He said he was not sure if someone had thrown something at his car, and he was being ambushed. He was not sure of anything. It was the middle of the night, on a dark road, with no lights. When he could not see anything, he got out of there.
111. Mr Reiman said he remembers very little from the time of the impact to the next morning. The impact was big and loud, his adrenaline was high, *"so if you want details from that night, then there's probably no point talking about it"*.
112. Mr Reiman said at the time of the collision, he was able to see another car about 200 metres in front of him. He said he would not have had high beams or spotlights on due to this but could not remember if his car's high beams were on or not.
113. Mr Reiman could not remember seeing the car in front of him change its line, and believed he was entirely within his own lane at the time of the collision.
114. He could not remember what speed he was travelling, as he could not recall whether the speed limit was 80 or 100km per hour at that section of road.
115. Mr Reiman could not say whether a breathalyser device in his car played a role. He had no memory of it going off at the time of collision. He initially said he definitely did not blow into it, as he would not blow into it while moving. He later said he pulled over most times, but may have used it while moving 'once or twice'. He said he tried not to blow into it while driving. He did not have many demerit points left, and did not want to lose his license.
116. Mr Reiman denied using any drugs on 11 June 2021. He admitted to having used drugs in the past but had been 'off them' for a 'while'.

117. Mr Reiman agreed he travelled down Beerburrum Road and turned right, onto D'Aguilar Highway, and then onto the Bruce Highway. That route took him past a camera near the intersection of Pumicestone Road and D'Aguilar Highway.<sup>6</sup> The camera captured a vehicle at about 11.55pm on 11 June 2021, according to the camera timestamp. Mr Reiman agreed this was his vehicle.
118. Mr Reiman's call charge records were obtained as part of the police investigation. Those records demonstrate between 11.55pm and just before midnight on 11 June 2021, Mr Reiman made eight calls to six different numbers. None of the calls were answered. Mr Reiman said he was phoning his mum, his stepfather, and brother to see if he could park his car at their house. He was concerned it was not roadworthy, and did not want to drive a car with defects all the way to his own home, when he was running low on licence points. He said when he was not able to get through, he continued on to his own home.
119. Mr Reiman agreed he had a short Messenger exchange with Mr Smith at 23 minutes past midnight on 12 June 2021. The first message is from Mr Smith enquiring about Mr Reiman's tyre. Mr Reiman responded to ask if Mr Smith had made it home ok, and indicated his tyre had held up, and had probably sealed itself up. During evidence at the inquest, Mr Reiman explained he had earlier had a tyre leak while out in the bush in the mud.

## **Recollections of Mr Reiman's family members of their discussions over the weekend of 12 and 13 June 2021**

### ***Mr Reiman's communications with his stepfather on Saturday***

120. Mr Reiman's stepfather, Wayne O'Shanesy, did not provide a statement to police. He provided a statutory declaration dated 26 June 2025 as part of the coronial investigation and gave evidence during the inquest.
121. Mr O'Shanesy was living in Caboolture in June 2021. On Friday 11 June 2021, he stayed overnight in Laidley. He travelled to Stanthorpe on Saturday before returning home to Caboolture that night on 12 June 2021. He had not informed Mr Reiman he would be away that weekend.
122. Mr O'Shanesy said, due to bad reception in Laidley, he did not become aware of missed calls from Mr Reiman until after leaving Laidley on Saturday. They eventually spoke at around lunchtime on Saturday 12 June 2021.
123. Mr O'Shanesy said Mr Reiman told him he had been four wheel driving with friends in Beerburrum, but when driving home along Beerburrum Road, he either said he "*had hit a kangaroo*" or "*thought he'd hit a kangaroo*", and the car was likely a write off. Mr Reiman did not say whether he saw a kangaroo and did not say anything about stopping the vehicle, or about an interlock (breathalyser).
124. Mr O'Shanesy said Mr Reiman was not emotional, but seemed quite blasé and serious, telling him the facts, "*and that was it*". Mr O'Shanesy put that down to him being disappointed about his car being a write off, knowing he had spent \$30,000 to \$40,000 on the car to add extras for four wheel driving.
125. Mr O'Shanesy said the conversation was pretty basic due to it being hard to hear. Mr Reiman invited his stepfather to come to a property in Wamuran owned by his girlfriend's family. They had been there together before. Mr O'Shanesy agreed he

<sup>6</sup> Traffic camera allocated number 12703.

might come Sunday. He thought mention was made of inviting Mr Reiman's brother, but he could not recall whether that was in this conversation or another.

126. Mr O'Shanesy said that he could not recall whether it was in this initial conversation or another one, but Mr Reiman said he had called the night before as he was going to drop the car off because it had been damaged.
127. Mr O'Shanesy said he had no idea that a man had been killed at the intersection of Beerburum Road when they had this conversation, and that even looking back on it now, there was nothing about the conversation that indicated to him that Mr Reiman was aware a man had been killed at this time.
128. Telephone call records are overall consistent with Mr O'Shanesy's recollections about the timing of these communications with Mr Reiman.

#### ***Mr O'Shanesy's communications with Ms Bridget Reiman on Saturday***

129. At another point on Saturday 12 June 2021, Mr O'Shanesy phoned his ex-partner, Mr Reiman's mother, Ms Bridget Reiman about the collision. Mr O'Shanesy explained he was out in the bush, with poor reception, and wanted to find out more information. He was not aware at that stage of any posts or news about a hit and run on Beerburum Road.
130. Ms Reiman informed Mr O'Shanesy of a report that a person had been hit while running in the early morning along Beerburum Road. They hoped it had nothing to do with Mr Reiman's accident and felt it could not be linked as the incident had happened at 7.00am according to some social media posts. Mr O'Shanesy said Ms Reiman told him there were lots of messages on the post.
131. Mr O'Shanesy said after his return to Caboolture, he had more conversations with Ms Reiman about developments in the news story, and they had a realisation that it could all be linked, either that night, or the next morning. He had several calls with Ms Reiman between the Saturday and Sunday.
132. Mr O'Shanesy said he tried to call Mr Reiman again on the Saturday, when he got back from Stanthorpe, but did not get through to him.

#### ***Mr O'Shanesy's communications with Mr Reiman on Sunday***

133. On Sunday 13 June 2021, Mr O'Shanesy collected his son Tyrone Reiman from Caboolture train station and they travelled to Wamuran. He did not mention his realisation Mr Reiman may have been involved in Mr Young's death.
134. After getting to Wamuran, Mr O'Shanesy asked Mr Reiman what happened. He said Mr Reiman told him he was driving along Beerburum Road and thought he had hit a kangaroo. Mr O'Shanesy asked if he had seen a kangaroo, and Mr Reiman responded 'no'. Mr O'Shanesy said he asked if he had seen a person, and Mr Reiman responded that 'no, he hadn't seen anything'. Mr Reiman told him he had pulled over, because it "*scared the shit out of him*", and looked in the side rear vision mirror, and did not see anything. He saw lights coming down the road from a car coming and he left. Mr Reiman did not say he got out of the car at any point according to Mr O'Shanesy.
135. Mr O'Shanesy also said Mr Reiman told him there had been a car about 200 metres in front of him, so he did not have high beams on. Mr O'Shanesy said he asked, "*How did you not see anything?*", and Mr Reiman kept responding "*I don't know, I don't*

*know*". Mr Reiman was screaming and freaking out. Mr O'Shanesy put it down to the realisation that something had happened. Mr O'Shanesy felt sick to the stomach and they went off in separate ways.

136. Mr O'Shanesy said during the Wamuran conversation, they spoke about the Facebook pages, news about the person who had been hit, and the possibility it was linked, and Mr Reiman needed to contact a lawyer straight away.
137. Mr O'Shanesy said that at no stage in that conversation, or subsequently, has Mr Reiman ever told him he saw he hit a person.
138. Mr O'Shanesy left Wamuran on Sunday and returned to Caboolture. He could not recall whether he spoke to Ms Reiman that evening, but thought they must have spoken as they had organised to travel back to Wamuran the next day to pick up Mr Reiman to take him to a solicitor's office on the Monday.
139. On Monday 14 June 2021, Mr O'Shanesy collected Mr Reiman from Wamuran with Ms Reiman, and took him to a solicitor's office in Caboolture.
140. Mr O'Shanesy said later, after his release from jail, Mr Reiman had said the car breathalyser beeped around the time of the accident, and it had distracted him.

#### ***Mr Reiman's communications with his mother***

141. Mr Reiman's mother, Ms Bridget Reiman, did not provide a statement in the police investigation, but provided a statutory declaration dated 26 June 2025 for the purposes of the inquest, and was called to give evidence at the inquest.

#### ***Ms Reiman's initial conversation with Mr Reiman on Saturday***

142. Ms Bridget Reiman was living in Narangba in June 2021. On the morning of 12 June 2021, she woke to a number of missed calls from her son timed from 11.54pm the night before. She knew he had been out four wheel driving the night before with friends because he had invited her to come.
143. Ms Reiman tried to call him back but did not get through initially. She recalled they spoke at about 11.00am. Ms Reiman said Mr Reiman told her that he had been coming home from the bush and had hit a kangaroo, He thought the car was totalled. He said he called because he was not sure if the car was going to make it home and might have to stop at her house.
144. Ms Reiman said he did not tell her that he had seen a kangaroo, but said "*I hit a kangaroo, it came out of nowhere*". She asked him how it happened, and he said the breathalyser in his car had beeped and startled him, and he looked down for a split second. He did not tell her he blew into the breathalyser.
145. She said he was upset he had hit a kangaroo. She said he told her he stopped and put his high beams and brake lights on to light up the area to see if he could locate the animal. He said to the effect "*I had to get back in my car*" when he saw lights coming down the road.
146. Mr Reiman mentioned being worried when stopped at road works on the way home, due to the car damage, but he was waved on.

### **Ms Reiman's account of discovering a local news post**

147. Ms Reiman said later on 12 June 2021, she saw a post from the local Moreton Daily News site on Facebook about a 'hit and run' where Mr Reiman had been.
148. She phoned Mr Reiman to tell him about the post and what people were saying in the comments. She said the time did not add up however, as Mr Reiman had called her at about 11.54pm on 11 June 2021, and people were saying in comments that people had seen a man standing on the road at 1.00am. Ms Reiman provided a number of Facebook extracts to demonstrate this:
  - a. Mr Palin stated, "*We were driving through there at about 1ish in the morning after coming down from the glasshouse lookout and he was standing in the middle of the road I swerved out and away from him and the car behind me did as well...*".
  - b. Mr Carey, replying to the post by Mr Palin, saying "*I think I was the car behind you, very scary place to be. I thought it was a kangaroo until the last second. Have given in a report and spoke to a few people I was with that night. Very unfortunate for the driver and family involved.*"
149. Ms Reiman described reading through the comments on the call with Mr Reiman, and because she saw people were saying the man was hit at 1.00am, she thought they were clearly separate incidents. Mr Reiman did not say anything in their conversation to indicate it was not a kangaroo he had hit.
150. Ms Reiman continued to follow the comments, and some were stating the man was out running at 7.00am. Ms Reiman said with this information, 'we' assumed it was a different incident. She did not believe it was the same incident because of the timings, when she knew Mr Reiman's collision had been at around 11.54pm the previous night.
151. Ms Reiman then noticed an updated post about a police appeal for information, along the lines the incident had occurred later Friday night, or early Saturday morning, and the person might not be aware they hit someone. Ms Reiman could not recall whether she saw this on Saturday night or Sunday morning.
152. Ms Reiman contacted Mr Reiman again to let him know. She said Mr Reiman was distraught and completely broke down saying something along the lines of "*It can't be possible. It couldn't be possible, because it's not the right time*". He was saying over and over again "*This can't be true. This can't be it*".
153. Ms Reiman said she told Mr Reiman, who she assumed was at Wamuran, they needed to contact a lawyer as soon as they could on Monday morning.
154. Ms Reiman could not recall speaking with Mr O'Shanesy on the Saturday. She accepted she may have told Mr O'Shanesy about the Facebook and news posts about a hit and run along Beerburum Road but could not actually recall.
155. Ms Reiman stated she travelled out to Wamuran on Monday morning, and Mr Reiman then attended a solicitor's office.

### **Tyrone Reiman's communications with Mr Reiman over the weekend**

156. On 12 June 2021, Mr Reiman's brother, Tyrone, woke up to a missed call from his brother from late the night before. He believes he messaged his brother back, but did not receive a response. He contacted his mother to find out if she knew why he was calling but could not recall if he received a response.

157. Tyrone said, they did manage to message on 12 June 2021, and his brother asked him to visit him at Wamuran. It seemed from the messages something was wrong, but Tyrone did not know what was wrong and did not ask. He was not aware on the Saturday that Mr Reiman had been in a collision.
158. When Tyrone got to Wamuran with Mr O'Shanesy on the Sunday, he said his brother seemed worried, he was very emotional, shut down, and not like his usual self. Mr Reiman did not say anything to Tyrone about what was wrong.
159. On the Monday, Tyrone said he, his mother and father went to the solicitor's office with Mr Reiman. Tyrone knew it "*wasn't for something good*", and knew Mr Reiman would be handing himself in, but he did not know what for.
160. The effect of Tyrone's evidence was his family did not inform him of what was going on over the course of the weekend, and did not discuss it with him. That is consistent with the evidence of Mr O'Shanesy, Ms Reiman, and Mr Reiman. Tyrone started to see news articles and then 'put two and two' together.
161. During oral evidence, Tyrone said the only conversation he had with his brother about the collision was on 19 June 2025, the night he provided his statutory declaration for the coroner. After giving the statement, he commented to Mr Reiman "*I've [never] even heard you mention the accident and that you were driving*". Tyrone said Mr Reiman admitted he was driving and thinks he said, "*he thought he hit a kangaroo*". Tyrone also thought his brother said he stopped and tried to see if he hit a kangaroo but could not see one and then left. Tyrone said he did not remember much of the conversation, other than his brother admitting he had been the driver, and about hitting a kangaroo.

## **Recollections of Mr Reiman's four wheel drive group members over the weekend 11 to 12 June 2021**

### ***Mr Sharp's communications with Mr Smith***

162. Mr Sharp recalled a conversation with Mr Smith and another friend at the friend's house over the weekend. Mr Sharp said he had had seen a Facebook post about a hit and run, but did not think much of it as he knew he hadn't hit anything.
163. Mr Sharp could not remember exactly who said it but thought Mr Smith had said 'Izzy' (Mr Reiman) had hit a kangaroo or thought he had hit a kangaroo. He also recalled being told Mr Reiman had reached for his breathalyser when it went off, and then hit what he thought was a kangaroo.
164. Mr Sharp said Mr Smith also told him that 'Izzy' was going for a drive to think about everything because he was scared it was him that did the hit and run.
165. Mr Sharp thought this conversation was on Saturday but clarified he had been at the other friend's house on both Saturday and Sunday.

### ***Mr Smith's communications with Mr Carey and Mr Sharp***

166. On Sunday 13 June 2021, Mr Smith said he had a phone conversation with Mr Carey after Mr Carey sent a screen shot of a Moreton Alert Facebook page about a hit and run on Beerburum Road. During this conversation, Mr Carey said "*I am not sure what happened, but Izzy said he thinks he may have hit a kangaroo. He said his interlock [breathalyser device] went off and had to blow into his interlock and something jumped in front of him which made him think it was a kangaroo*".

167. Mr Smith said he was 100 percent sure he was informed of this by Mr Carey, and it was on the Sunday. Mr Reiman had sent him messages on Saturday evening asking for Mr Carey's contact details, the last of these being at 8.52pm. Mr Smith did then send Mr Carey's details to Mr Reiman.
168. In oral evidence at the inquest, Mr Smith confirmed he had been at his friend's house over the weekend and believed he shared the conversation he had with Mr Carey, to Mr Sharp. Mr Smith believed this conversation with Mr Sharp was on the Sunday, not the Saturday. He said that he was not aware a man had been killed until Sunday, when Mr Carey told him about it. Mr Smith's recalled the conversation with Mr Sharp was after police spoke to them, on the Sunday.
169. Mr Smith did not have any communications with Mr Reiman about the collision, and was only communicating to Mr Sharp things that Mr Carey had told him.

***Mr Carey's communications with Mr Smith and Mr Reiman***

170. Mr Carey said police attended his house on Sunday morning, and he provided his first statement that day, 13 June 2021. Mr Carey stated Mr Reiman had contacted him on Saturday asking if he remembered anything from Friday night. Mr Carey had said 'no'. He was then not aware of the fatal hit and run.
171. Mr Carey said he was aware of a fatal hit and run on Sunday morning, when police came to his house. Mr Carey clarified the conversation with Mr Reiman was after 8.52pm on Saturday as this was when he requested contact details.
172. Mr Carey provided a further police statement on Monday 14 June 2021. After leaving the police station on Sunday afternoon, he sent Mr Reiman a message asking if he was alright, and where he was. Mr Carey had pieced together what had happened by this point. Mr Reiman replied he was out in the bush, trying to clear his head and process what happened. Mr Carey replied along the lines everything would be alright. Mr Reiman said he was waiting to hear from a lawyer and would be going to the police station on Monday morning.
173. At the inquest, Mr Carey was asked if he had said to Mr Smith that:

*"I'm not sure what happened, but Izzy said he thinks he may have hit a kangaroo. He said his interlock went off, and had to blow into his interlock and something jumped in front of him which made him think it was a kangaroo".*

Mr Carey replied, *"Yeah, that does jog my memory, yeah. Yeah, I believe I did say that to Lachlan".*

174. When asked if Mr Reiman had told him that, Mr Carey said *"Yes. I would say, yes."* He added he could not remember when this was said, but thought it was after he made his statement to police on 13 June 2021.
175. Mr Carey's evidence on this point is in contrast to his evidence at the committal where the following exchange occurred with Mr Carey:

*Part of your jobs is – part of your job description is you, in fact, install interlocks; is that correct? ---Correct, yes.*

*So you're aware of the interlock device? ---Yeah.*

*Were you aware that Izzy had an interlock in his vehicle - - -? ---Yes, I was.*

- - - at the relevant time? ---At – I was.

Yeah? ---That's how we met.

*So certainly if Izzy had said to you something along of lines of his interlock went off and he had to blow in his interlock and something jumped in front of him which he thought was a kangaroo, you'd remember that conversation? ---I would, yes.*

*Yeah. But you don't recall - - -? ---I don't believe so, no.*

## **Mr Reiman's recollections**

176. Mr Reiman's evidence about his communications with others over the weekend of 11 to 12 June 2021 was notable for his lack of recollection of any communications about the collision. He attributed this to the adrenaline of the accident, the stress of subsequent events, and his mental health.
177. Mr Reiman described it was a particularly stressful time in his life. His mother and stepfather confirmed their observations about the effects of the collision and subsequent events on his mental health in their statutory declarations.
178. When asked about conversations he had over the weekend, point early in his evidence Mr Reiman said, *"I can't – I have no idea. No memory. Before you even go down that track, I can't remember. I can't remember anything I told anyone the following days after that, to be honest. So any question you ask is going to be the same."*
179. When asked whether he had a number of calls with his mother and stepfather on Saturday, Mr Reiman stated, *"I'm not sure"* and also said *"I do believe I did, but I'm not – I can't recall what I did Saturday."* He said he was not able to recall any of his conversations with his mother or stepfather on the Saturday, adding *"No. I don't know what was said. I can't remember."*
180. Although Mr Reiman said he had no recollection of having a conversation with Mr O'Shanesy on the Saturday, he agreed he most probably did. He was asked whether he told Mr O'Shanesy he had hit a kangaroo. Mr Reiman agreed it was possible but was not sure what he said. He said he was not sure if he said the car was probably a write off, or if he said that he was going to Wamuran. Mr Reiman said he went to the property at Wamuran all the time.
181. Mr Reiman could not remember having a conversation with Mr O'Shanesy when at Wamuran together. When asked if he told Mr O'Shanesy at Wamuran that he hit a kangaroo, Mr Reiman said he was not sure, adding, *"Honestly, I'm not sure what I've said to who when, what, where, why."* He said he did not know whether he had told Mr O'Shanesy he stopped on the road to see if he could see anything, or whether Mr O'Shanesy told him it was possible it was all linked and he would need to contact a lawyer.
182. Mr Reiman said he was not sure when he came to realise over the course of the weekend he had hit a person. He could not now say whether it was a developing process involving conversations with his mother. He could not recall discussions with his mother about Facebook posts and repeated *"I don't remember very much from that weekend, I've said it multiple times."*
183. When asked if he discussed with his mother, over the course of the Saturday, the fact a man had been killed in the area where he had a collision, and the Facebook

comments about timings for that event, Mr Reiman was again unsure and said he could not remember.

184. Mr Reiman was asked whether he had told his mother he used his spotlights and high beams and brake lights to look after the collision. Mr Reiman said *"I can't remember what I told anyone else. I may have used my brake lights, I may have not. I don't remember. I definitely had my phone, but I don't know what else I used."*
185. When asked if he had told his mother his interlock went off and startled him, he said, *"I told you I can't remember what I told my mother."* He said he could not recall it, so could not agree to it, nor deny it.
186. He could not remember if he had asked his brother Tyrone to come and see him on the Saturday. He accepted he may have, but did not know.
187. Mr Reiman was also taken to the messages from the Saturday with Mr Smith, where Mr Reiman asked for Mr Carey's contact details at 8.52pm. Mr Reiman was shown these messages. Mr Reiman could not recall if he had Mr Carey's number then, but said it stood to reason he did not if he had to ask for it.
188. When asked if he had told Mr Carey that his interlock went off and he had to blow into it and something jumped in front of him, he was unable to recall. He said he remembered very little of his conversations at that time, and did not have memories of that month, let alone that day.
189. Ultimately, Mr Reiman consistently stated that he could not remember the contents of communications he had over the weekend of 12 to 13 June 2021.
190. Mr Reiman was invited to speak to mental health issues. He declined saying, *"I don't particularly want to talk about my mental health. I'm not saying there's nothing there, but I'd rather not be - go into that."* At the conclusion of his evidence, he was given a further opportunity to explain his mental health and his poor recollection. He said, *"Yeah, I've got some mental health problems, but I don't really want to play on that card."* He said it was a *"tough time"*, but he did not want to be one of those people running mental health *"excuses"*.

## **Breathalyser data**

191. Mr Reiman's vehicle was fitted with an interlock device from Guardian Interlock Systems Australia Pty Ltd. The model was a Guardian 2030 Alcohol Interlock. The device was seized by police and the data from the device was captured.
192. Ms Erin Laws provided expert evidence regarding the operation and data logging of the device. She was intimately familiar with the device's operation and compliance requirements, having been with the company since 2009.
193. Ms Laws explained that the Guardian 2030 interlock device was a breath alcohol device which connects to a vehicle's ignition system. To start the vehicle's engine, the user must first blow and pass a deep lung breath sample into the interlock. The interlock measures the alcohol concentration of the breath sample and prevents the vehicle from starting if the alcohol concentration exceeds a preset value of 0.02. The device records all breath tests, driving times, disconnection and any detected attempts at tampering.
194. The device also requires retests to be conducted. In the Queensland program parameters, the first random retest was requested three to 10 minutes after the initial

test. Subsequent retests were requested randomly 15 to 60 minutes after that. A user is given seven minutes to take the test. There is training and guidance to recommend users should pull over to take the retest, but there is no mechanism to prevent the test being done while the vehicle is in motion.

195. The device will indicate the need for retest on the LCD screen and by audible beeping tones. The tones start at intervals of 30 seconds. As the countdown decreases, the beeps become more frequent. In the final minute of the seven minute retest period, beeping will persistently sound each second.
196. Data from Mr Reiman's device includes ignition start times and other events of tests being taken, and whether they were passed. Ms Laws explained that the time stamps in the data are accurate only to within 15 minutes. That was because the time on the device was set from the Windows computer it was being serviced on. If the time on the computer showed more than a 15 minute difference from local time, the software required to service the interlock would not operate. The computers are set up with automatic time zone settings based on their location. Ms Laws explained that if the time was off on the computer, but off by less than 15 minutes, no alert would arise. She said there was no way for her to now analyse whether the computer used to set the time for Mr Reiman's interlock device was in fact accurate back in 2021.
197. Ms Laws reviewed the data obtained from Mr Reiman's interlock device, and provided the court with an explanation of what various entries in that data meant over the period 10.25pm on 11 June 2021 to 12.27am on 12 June 2021.
198. Ms Laws addressed the following entries in the device from 11 June 2021:
  - a. At 10.25.41pm, the vehicle engine was turned off.
  - b. At 10.25.44pm, the key was turned to the accessories position, which powered the interlock device.
  - c. At 10.28.48pm, the interlock beeped, and a screen displayed 'blow', allowing a test. The test was taken at 10.43.48pm, some 15 minutes later. Ms Laws said in that time, as it was not a retest, the machine would not have kept beeping. It appeared someone got in the car and turned on accessories, such as a radio or a heater, but did not start the engine.
  - d. At 10.43.56pm, a pass result was displayed.
  - e. At 10.43.58pm, the interlock displayed 'start'. At this point, a three minute countdown starts, allowing time for the person to start the vehicle. If three minutes expire, another test would have been required.
  - f. At 10.44.11pm, the vehicle engine was turned on.
  - g. At 10.50.44pm, an initial retest was required. This is the initial retest that occurs within the first seven to 10 minute window. The interlock beeps every 20 to 30 seconds and the LCD displays 'blow'.
  - h. At 10.51.05pm seconds, the user took the retest.
  - i. At 10.51.13pm, the interlock beeped, and the screen displayed a pass result of 0.001. Ms Laws explained that very low readings were not uncommon as many

food and drinks and other items in the mouth can generate low level blood alcohol readings for short periods of time.

- j. At 11.44.05pm, a little over 50 minutes later, a further random test was required. The interlock beeped every 20 to 30 seconds and the screen displayed 'blow'. The seven minute countdown started.
  - k. At 11.47.08pm, the user took the retest. At this point the interlock would have been beeping every 10 to 20 seconds.
  - l. At 11.47.16pm, the interlock displayed a pass result of 0.003.
  - m. The next random test process commenced at 12.18.48am on 12 June 2021. That test was also passed.
  - n. The vehicle engine was turned off at 12.24.10am on 12 June 2021.
199. The interlock data also demonstrates that once the vehicle engine was turned off in the early hours of 12 June 2021, it was not re-started again until 24 June 2021. It is noted that the car was seized from Mr Reiman's driveway on Sunday 13 June 2021 and towed to a police examination area.
200. Ms Laws advised that interlock data is not editable. The interlock was installed in the vehicle on 7 August 2020 and was last serviced on 11 May 2021.

## **Was Mr Reiman aware he had struck a person at the time of collision?**

### **Reliability of Mr Reiman**

201. Mr Reiman was not a reliable witness. He had poor recollection of most aspects of the evidence between 11 to 14 June 2021. His poor recollection, inconsistencies, and contradictory evidence given by some witnesses on some topics, meant his evidence had to be approached with caution.
202. Mr Reiman's evidence needed to be evaluated in light of all other corroborating and contradictory evidence heard and considered. It is possible his struggles with mental health, the traumatic nature of the event, and its immediate consequences, played some role in the reliability of his evidence.

### **Evidence about Mr Reiman's awareness of what happened**

203. Having regard to the seriousness of the finding, and the evidence gathered and considered, I am unable to find to the requisite standard, that Mr Reiman was aware he struck a person at the time of impact, or while he was at the scene.
204. Mr Reiman was adamant he did not see what he collided with. His evidence should, however, be treated with caution.
205. The impact, while significant, and on the driver's side of the vehicle, would have been unexpected and sudden. The windscreen had smeared mud marks, and it cannot be excluded this may have impaired his visibility at least to some extent.
206. Mr Young was wearing dark coloured clothing, and the area was not well lit. Other cars, although ultimately seeing Mr Young, only narrowly avoided a collision, suggesting difficulty perceiving him on the road.

207. Mr Young's body was found in a ditch after the collision, rather than on the roadway, which would likely have obscured his identification at the time.
208. Mr Reiman's series of unanswered phone calls on the night in question do not prove an awareness that he had struck a person. The explanation for the calls was his concern about the roadworthiness of his car, low demerit points, and wanting to drive to family homes closer to the location than his own home.
209. Mr Reiman's subsequent conversations, particularly the initial conversations on the Saturday with his mother and stepfather referred to him hitting a kangaroo, or what he thought was a kangaroo, and do not demonstrate that he knew that he had struck a person. The evidence demonstrates he and members of his family started to piece together he had struck a person over the course of the weekend of 12 and 13 June 2021. It cannot be demonstrated Mr Reiman was aware he had hit a person at a point prior to news of the death of Mr Young being shared on Facebook and discovered by his mother.
210. Mr Reiman's conduct in going to Wamuran does not demonstrate he had knowledge of the collision with a person at the time it occurred.
211. His car was located at his home by police, on the driveway, visible from the street. It had not been washed, nor had any attempts been made to conceal the damage or hide the vehicle.
212. Mr Reiman has made no admissions to knowing he struck a human over the course of the weekend, or at any other time, including in his oral evidence.

### **Was Mr Reiman distracted by the breathalyser?**

213. There is evidence Mr Reiman told his mother and stepfather, and potentially others, he was distracted by the breathalyser beeping at the time of the collision.
214. The interlock timestamp data shows a random retest was required at 11.44.05pm on 11 June 2021, and Mr Reiman took the retest at 11.47.08pm. During this period, the interlock would have been beeping with increasing frequency. It is noted that the device had been in the vehicle for some time, and Mr Reiman must have heard it beep on many occasions.
215. Mr Reiman said he could not recall whether his interlock had beeped or played a role in the collision.
216. Although Mr Reiman's evidence is being treated with caution, I am unable to make a definitive finding that the breathalyser beeping caused a distraction that led to the collision. The precise time Mr Young was struck is unknown and the interlock timestamp cannot be demonstrated to be precisely accurate. Similarly, I cannot make a finding the interlock did not beep at the time of the collision, or did not startle Mr Reiman at the time of the collision.
217. Ultimately, it is possible the breathalyser did beep at the time of collision, but on the whole of the evidence, it cannot properly be found that it did or did not.

### **Was Mr Reiman blowing into the breathalyser?**

218. Mr Reiman initially said he definitely was not blowing into the breathalyser at the time of collision, as he did not do so while driving. His later admission he had done this on occasion means his evidence on this topic should be approached with caution.

219. There is also insufficient evidence to find Mr Reiman told Mr Carey he blew into his breathalyser device because Mr Carey's recollection on this point was inconsistent. While he initially did not recall the conversation with Mr Smith to this effect, he later agreed, when that conversation was put to him it "*does jog my memory*". At the committal, however, when the same proposition was put to him, Mr Carey rejected it, stating "*I don't believe so, no*". This inconsistency undermines the reliability of this specific piece of evidence.
220. Further, as above, the inability to determine the precise time Mr Young was struck, and where the interlock timestamps cannot be shown to be precisely accurate, means it cannot be found Mr Reiman was blowing into the breathalyser device at the time of the collision.

### **Vehicle speed and operation**

221. A finding cannot be made that Mr Reiman was speeding or otherwise operating his vehicle in an unsafe manner at the time of the collision.
222. The speed limit at the intersection was 100km/h. Dr Carnavas could not determine the precise speed at the moment of impact from pedestrian projection distance alone, but considered it was close to 100km/h.
223. Mr Reiman acknowledged he had accumulated many speeding fines and had received fines for hooning behaviour. He accepted he had a propensity for speeding, but did not accept he was speeding at the time. The historical conduct is insufficient to establish excessive speed was a factor in this specific collision.

### **Influence of drugs or alcohol**

224. The interlock data demonstrates that Mr Reiman was not under the influence of alcohol at the time of the collision.
225. It cannot be found that Mr Reiman was under the influence of other drugs at the time of the collision. Mr Reiman's evidence that he had not used drugs on 11 June 2021 should be treated with caution as he initially denied using drugs, but later said he used them in the past, but had been off them for a while. He admitted to messages on his phone about drugs on the evening of 12 June 2021.
226. There is however no direct evidence to confirm drug use on 11 June 2021, and some accounts of witnesses who were four wheel driving with Mr Reiman on 11 June 2021 do not suggest he had been using drugs or appeared intoxicated. It would be impermissibly speculative to find that he was under the influence of drugs at the time of the collision with Mr Young.

### **Could Mr Young's life have been saved with emergency treatment?**

227. Dr Forde, forensic pathologist advised Mr Young's death would have occurred almost immediately due to the severe and extensive injuries.
228. Dr Benjamin Close, a Senior Staff Specialist in Emergency Medicine was engaged to address various questions, including whether Mr Young might have survived if emergency services had been contacted at the time of the collision.
229. Dr Close provided a report and gave evidence at the inquest concluding Mr Young suffered multiple injuries that each would have been imminently life threatening. He likely passed away as quickly as within seconds, but no more than 10 minutes after

impact. The presence of multiple imminently life threatening injuries would likely have hastened the timing of his death.

230. Due to the number, nature and severity of the injuries, Mr Young would have died at the scene regardless of any hypothetical emergency services response.
231. Dr Close agreed the severity of the injuries may indicate an element of overrun, but accepted there was every chance the injuries could have occurred without Mr Young being runover. He agreed Mr Young was likely struck when standing but could not say which way Mr Young was likely facing at the time of impact.

## **Did Mr Young intend for his life to end in this way?**

### **Mr Young's state of mind**

232. Ms Lees said that Mr Young had never been suicidal in his actions, words or emotions, and had never threatened suicide. He did not agree with suicide. She said he did not mention suicide on this night, and did not mention anything that indicated to her he was suicidal. As far as she knew, he was not on mental health medication and had not consulted a mental health practitioner.<sup>7</sup>
233. Ms Lees also said Mr Young had previously left the house when he needed to let off steam. He would generally go to a family member or go out walking. If something was going on for Mr Young, even at 3.00am in the morning, he would walk or run as a way of clearing his head.
234. Mr Young's sister Katrina Dewez provided evidence of their close relationship. Her observation was that Mr Young and Ms Lees had a very good relationship. Ms Dewez was not aware of any mental health concerns for her brother. She spoke to him by phone frequently and had last seen him a few weeks earlier. He had seemed his normal self in her interactions.
235. Ms Dewez recalled her conversations with Ms Lees and Mr Young on the evening of 11 June 2021 about arrangements for their mother's medical appointment. Mr Young essentially told Ms Dewez in text messages about the argument with Ms Lees. Ms Dewez understood he was annoyed but he was speaking like he normally would when annoyed. Ms Dewez also received a phone call from Mr Young where he mentioned the argument and that Ms Lees had gone to bed. They ended their conversation with Mr Young confirming he would be at his niece's birthday party the next day. They then exchanged more text messages.
236. Ms Dewez said that she had always known her brother as a person who would go for a walk when stressed or under pressure. She was aware he was excited about the growth of his business. Mr Young had never raised mental health concerns with her or reported suicidal thoughts, despite significant life events. Their family was close, and family members were always available to support each other. She did not have any concerns about his mental health on the evening of 11 June 2021. She had assumed he had been having a few drinks from the texts, but aside from that, she did not notice anything out of character.
237. A close friend of Mr Young provided a statement as part of the coronial investigation. The friend and her husband were friends with Mr Young through working in the same

<sup>7</sup> A Coronal requirement was issued to Medicare to obtain Mr Young's Medicare claims history and PBS Claims history. There are no mental health related item numbers on Mr Young's Medicare claims history, and there were no relevant items recorded on his PBS claims history.

industry. She spoke to Mr Young on 11 June 2021 about work matters. They also had a general chat, including about a video posted on Facebook of his recent wedding, the new house, children, and work. Mr Young agreed he would complete some work for her on Tuesday, and they could have lunch and talk more. The friend described Mr Young seemed very positive and did not advise any stresses. It appeared his business was growing.

238. Another friend also provided a statement as part of the coronial investigation. This friend had spoken with Mr Young on 10 June 2021. They had discussed the new house, how his business was progressing, movements in Sydney, and looking after his mother. Mr Young seemed in a very happy state of mind and positive about his business and moving to the new house. The friend recalled thinking it was good to see he was going well and happy.

### **My Young's conduct**

239. Although Mr Young was not taking care for his safety on the night in question, and remained on the road after earlier cars took evasive action to avoid him, I am not satisfied Mr Young intended for his life to be ended or to be struck by a car.
240. The evidence shows Mr Young was intoxicated to some extent, with postmortem toxicology showing alcohol levels consistent with impaired judgment. The observations of him on CCTV and taken by a passing motorist are also suggestive of some level of intoxication.
241. Despite his presence on the road when other cars passed by, he was not seen to deliberately move into the path of any car, and there is no evidence he did so at the time of impact. He was wearing over-the ear headphones playing loud music, and likely had his hoodie up over his head at the time, which would have impaired his awareness of his surroundings. It is not clear which way he was facing at the time of impact.
242. Although he and Ms Lees had argued, Mr Young was known to go for walks to 'let off steam' or 'clear his head'. The last communication from Ms Lees was she loved him. By all accounts, they had a loving and strong relationship.
243. There were no statements indicating an intention to take his own life, either on that night or on any other occasion.

### **Coroners Act 2003 section 45(2) findings**

**Identity of the deceased** Collin James Young

**How he died** Mr Young died when he was struck by a vehicle being driven by Isaiah Paul Reiman. Mr Young had been standing at about the centre line on Beerburrum Road at the time he was struck. The mechanism of the collision from the moment of impact was in the following chronological order:

- a. Impact of the thigh/s and pelvis by the right front corner leading edge of the Toyota (the portion of bullbar in front of the right headlamp), with the most significant impact forces experienced by the body side facing the vehicle.

- b. The body would have been lifted slightly and 'wrapped' around the nose of the Toyota with torso and probably arms and head impacting the bonnet.
- c. Because the impact force was applied close to the body's centre of gravity, the body would not have substantively rotated by impact, nor lifted onto the windscreen, but would have remained 'caught up' at the front of the Toyota.
- d. Mr Young would have been carried on the offside front corner of the Toyota for some metres forward from the point of impact.
- e. After the effects of the initial impact acceleration between the Toyota and Mr Young subsided, he would have started to slip off to the side of the Toyota.
- f. Hitting the road at speed, Mr Young would have tumbled/travelled diagonally along and across the roadway and grassed verge, coming to rest in the drain.

I am not satisfied Mr Reiman was aware he had hit a person at the time of collision. I am satisfied Mr Young's life could not have been saved even if emergency services had been called immediately. I am not satisfied Mr Young intended to end his life.

<b>Place of death</b>	At the intersection of Beerburrum Road, and Porter Road, Caboolture, Queensland.
<b>Date of death</b>	11 to 12 June 2021.
<b>Cause of death</b>	Multiple injuries, due to, or as a consequence of a motor vehicle collision (pedestrian).

### **Section 46 Coroners Act 2003 comments and recommendations**

244. This matter does not give rise to any relevant recommendations.

### **Section 48 Coroners Act 2003 referrals of offences or misconduct**

245. Section 48(2) of the Coroners Act 2003 imposes an obligation on a coroner, who reasonably suspects a person has committed an offence, to give information to:

- a. For an indictable offence, the Director of Public Prosecutions.
- b. For any other offence, the chief executive of the department in which the legislation creating the offence is administered.

'Committed an offence' is taken to mean there is admissible evidence that could prove the necessary elements to the criminal standard. That would include the evidence necessary to rebut any defence reasonably raised by the evidence.<sup>8</sup>

'Reasonably suspects' is a low threshold. The standard for referral is distinct from the standard of proof required for a criminal conviction.

246. This inquest has carefully reviewed all of the evidence presented, including the material gathered in the police investigation and prior proceedings, the material gathered in the coronial investigation, the expert testimony, and the oral evidence of witnesses, and consideration has been given to whether there is a reasonable suspicion that any person has committed an offence.
247. It is noted a Magistrate has already dismissed a charge against Mr Reiman arising out of the circumstance of the collision, and police have previously discontinued a summary charge stemming from their investigations into Mr Young's death. Whilst these factors do not, in themselves, preclude a referral under section 48(2), if the evidence before the inquest independently raises a reasonable suspicion of an offence, the evidence, when viewed objectively and considering all circumstances, does not give rise to a reasonable suspicion a person has committed an offence.
248. Based on the totality of the evidence, no section 48(2) referral is required.

## Conclusion

249. I express my sincere condolences to Mr Young's family and friends. Rest in peace Mr Young.

I close the inquest.



Megan Fairweather  
Coroner  
BRISBANE  
17 December 2025

<sup>8</sup> See State Coroner's Guidelines 2013.