

## Details to 'provide balance'

FAMILY COURT principal judge Peter Boshier has asked the *Sunday Star-Times* to reveal more details about a woman with cancer, whose experience with the court was the basis for the September 2 article, "If I die, it gets rid of the problem".

"Erica" called her experience a nightmare, saying the court was unsympathetic to her problems, and that a judge at one point had refused to excuse her attendance on medical grounds. The article said while her disease was in remission, her oncologist said it would return, and she should budget \$300,000 for drug treatment.

The woman, who has been involved in a relationship property dispute since 2010, said she had been forced to represent herself, boning up on relationship law on the internet while living on a benefit, after the court denied access to a trust account to cover her legal bills.

She remains in the \$1.5 million home she shared with her corporate high-flyer ex-husband, and has resisted efforts to sell it because of problems with a leak and other damage.

Judge Boshier furnished documents to "provide balance", asking the *Star-Times* to print an extract from the oncologist's letter: "This is a low grade disease that is readily placed in remission with combination chemotherapy and immunotherapy. Her disease is one that will ultimately have a relapsing course and whilst there is no physical evidence of tumour progression at present, this is something that should be anticipated and closely monitored."

He also asked us to print part of the letter naming the disease, but the paper will not, in case it identifies the woman.

Other documents, most already seen by the *Star-Times*, were provided.

One, from the ex-husband's lawyer, sets out a timeline suggesting "Erica" was unco-operative because sale agreements were reached but she withdrew, and because she told her ex-husband no further communication could occur. *Star-Times* editor David Kerneys said the article was clearly one woman's anonymous account of her experience before the court, at a time when such issues were firmly in the public mind.