



MAGISTRATES COURT *of* TASMANIA

CORONIAL DIVISION

Record of Investigation into Death (Without Inquest)

Coroners Act 1995
Coroners Rules 2006
Rule 11

I, Olivia McTaggart, Coroner, having investigated the death of Shane Geoffrey Barker

Find, pursuant to Section 28(1) of the *Coroners Act 1995*, that

- a) The identity of the deceased is Shane Geoffrey Barker, date of birth 22 January 1973.

Mr Barker was 36 years of age, lived alone in Campbell Town and was employed at Roberts Pty Ltd.¹ He was divorced from his wife, Rachel Jordan, the couple having separated acrimoniously in 2007. Mr Barker and Ms Jordan had a daughter who was five years of age at the time of her father's death. Ms Jordan's parents, and former parents-in-law to Mr Barker, are Cedric and Noelene Jordan ("Mr and Mrs Jordan"). Subsequent to the time of the separation, Mr and Mrs Jordan held the belief that Mr Barker had seriously sexually assaulted their daughter; and also that Mr Barker was sexually interfering with his daughter when she was staying with him.² Mr and Mrs Jordan therefore formed a joint plan to kill Mr Barker. Pursuant to this plan, on 2 August 2009, Mr and Mrs Jordan went to Mr Barker's residence with a .22 firearm fitted with a silencer and loaded with sub-sonic bullets. Just before 7.00pm, when Mr Barker arrived home from visiting his parents at their nearby home, Mr Jordan shot Mr Barker four times. One of the shots (to the chest) penetrated Mr Barker's kidney, stomach, heart and aorta, causing fatal injuries. Mr Barker was able to crawl inside his house and lock the door but died on the floor in the hallway a short time later. He was discovered deceased the following day when he did not arrive for work.

¹ An agricultural supplies business, where Mr Barker was a storeman.

² The truth of these allegations cannot be determined, and it is not my role to assess their veracity. Complaints and referrals to police and child protection did not proceed. In his interview by police about the allegations in respect of his daughter, Mr Barker denied them and expressed the view that they were invented by Ms Jordan and her parents to prevent him having access to his daughter. In her statutory declaration, Mr Barker's mother said that Mr Barker was "*devastated*" by the false allegations.

- b) Mr Barker died as a result of a gunshot wound of the chest. He died as a result of homicide, being an intentional action by Mr Jordan to bring about the death of Mr Barker. At all material times, Mrs Jordan assisted Mr Jordan in carrying out the homicide.
- c) Mr Barker died on 2 August 2009 at Campbell Town, Tasmania.

In making the above findings, I have had regard to the investigation evidence and Supreme Court documentation relating to Mr Barker's death. This includes:

- The Police Report of Death for the Coroner;
- Affidavits confirming identity;
- Affidavit of the forensic pathologist, Dr Christopher Lawrence, regarding cause of death;
- Comprehensive Tasmania Police Subject Report prepared from the documentary evidence (13 folders) by Detective Sergeant Nathan Hartnett;
- Report to Coroner of Detective Sergeant Nathan Hartnett dated 23 January 2026;
- Comments on Passing Sentence of Justice Pearce dated 28 June 2023 - Cedric Jordan and Noelene Jordan;
- Memorandum of Sentence Noelene Jordan dated 28 June 2023;
- Memorandum of Sentence Cedric Jordan dated 28 June 2023;
- Decision of the Supreme Court of Tasmania (Court of Criminal Appeal): *Jordan and Jordan v Tasmania* [2025] TASCCA 12;
- Statutory declaration of Barbara Barker, mother of Mr Barker, dated 12 September 2019;
- Statutory Declaration of Constable Julie Burbury, police officer attending the scene of Mr Barker's death; and
- Statutory Declaration of Detective Senior Sergeant Ricky Newman, original lead investigator, who attended the scene of Mr Barker's death.

Comments and Recommendations

Following Mr Barker's homicide, there was a lengthy investigation by Tasmania Police including, in 2015, the commencement of a review by the Serious Organised Crime Division focusing upon Mr and Mrs Jordan as suspects.

On 11 May 2020, Mr and Mrs Jordan first appeared in the Hobart Court of Petty Sessions having each been charged with the murder of Mr Barker. They pleaded not

guilty to the charge, consistent with their denials and lies to police investigators over many years.

On 23 June 2023, they were both found guilty of murder by a jury after a 10-week trial in the Supreme Court of Tasmania. His Honour Justice Pearce sentenced Mr and Mrs Jordan each to a period of imprisonment of 22 years from 2 January 2023, with a non-parole period of 12 years.

Mr and Mrs Jordan appealed their convictions for murder.

On 23 September 2025 the Court of Criminal Appeal dismissed their appeals.³

Attached to this finding are the comments on passing sentence of Justice Pearce.

The evidence gathered in the investigation concerning the circumstances of Mr Barker's death is consistent with the guilty verdicts and the factual findings made by Justice Pearce in sentencing Mr and Mrs Jordan. Further, my above findings⁴ are not inconsistent with the determination of the matter by the criminal proceedings as required by Section 25 (4) of the *Coroners Act* 1995.

Because of the outcome of the criminal proceedings, I am not mandated to hold a public inquest into the death of Mr Barker pursuant to section 24 the *Coroners Act* 1995. I also do not consider that, in my discretion, it is desirable to hold a public inquest into his death.

The circumstances of death are not such as to require me to make any comments or recommendations pursuant to Section 28 (2) and (3) of the *Coroners Act* 1995.

I extend my appreciation to investigating officer Detective Sergeant Nathan Hartnett for his investigation and report.

I convey my sincere condolences to the family and loved ones of Mr Shane Geoffrey Barker.

Dated: 4 September 2026 at Hobart, in the State of Tasmania.

Olivia McTaggart
Coroner

³ Jordan and Jordan v Tasmania [2025] TASCCA 12.

⁴ Under the heading of section 28(1)(b).

ANNEXURE A

STATE OF TASMANIA v CEDRIC HARPER JORDAN and NOELENE JUNE JORDAN**COMMENTS ON PASSING SENTENCE****28 JUNE 2023
PEARCE J**

Cedric Jordan and Noelene Jordan were both found guilty by a jury of the murder of Shane Barker. It is my duty to impose sentence in accordance with the verdict. It is for me to determine the factual basis of the sentence. Facts adverse to the defendants must be proved beyond reasonable doubt. However, because the only real issue in this trial was the identity of the murderer, the facts almost all follow from the verdict. Mr Barker was killed on 2 August 2009 at the house in which he then lived alone at 2 East Street in Campbell Town. He was shot four times with sub-sonic bullets fired from the same .22 calibre firearm fitted with a silencer. Three shots struck his back and entered his upper torso. The fourth shot struck the front of his body but caused a relatively superficial injury. The internal chest injuries from one of the bullets caused his death. I find that he was shot just before 7.00 pm, in the driveway of the house shortly after he had arrived home from having dinner with his parents. I am satisfied from Dr Lawrence's evidence about the angle of the bullet wounds and other evidence about the scene that one of the shots struck Mr Barker when he was standing and caused him to either fall onto all fours or onto his stomach. The remaining shots, including the fatal shot, struck him when he was on the ground. Despite having been shot Mr Barker did not die immediately. He was able to make his way inside his house where he collapsed and died in the hallway a short time later. His body was not found until the following morning when he did not arrive for work.

The circumstances of the murder leave no room for any doubt that this was a planned, pre-mediated and intentional murder. The jury was unanimously satisfied that either Mr or Mrs Jordan fired the fatal shot. I find it to have been Mr Jordan. He had a lifetime of experience in the use of firearms. Mrs Jordan had some familiarity with firearms but hardly ever used them. The murder weapon was likely an unregistered .22 pump action rifle formerly owned by Mrs Jordan's father. It has never been recovered but would have been easy to dispose of. Even though Mr Jordan fired the fatal shot both he and his wife are equally responsible for the murder. Regardless of which of them shot Mr Barker there is no reason to distinguish between them in sentence. The mobile phone which was usually in Mrs Jordan's control was taken through Campbell Town at about the time the murder was committed. Mr and Mrs Jordan were almost always together and they admitted having driven together through Campbell Town, even though they denied having committed the murder. Mrs Jordan must have been aware of the firearm in the car. After the crime they told many jointly concocted lies aimed at concealing their role in the crime. I am satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that they travelled

to Campbell Town together to carry out their common intention to kill Mr Barker.

It must follow I think that both Mr and Mrs Jordan were motivated by ill feeling towards Mr Barker and a wish to remove him from the lives of their daughter and granddaughter. He had been married to their daughter Rachel and there was one child of the relationship. Mr Barker and Rachel Jordan separated about two and a half years before his murder. Mr and Mrs Jordan were close to, and highly protective of, their daughter and granddaughter. They perceived that Mr Barker had behaved very badly towards them in various ways. Perhaps most significantly they believed that Mr Barker was sexually abusing his child, their granddaughter. Complaints to the police and the child protection authorities went nowhere, and contact between Mr Barker and his daughter was continuing pursuant to orders of the Family Court. The jury must have been satisfied that Mr and Mrs Jordan decided to take matters into their own hands. It is impossible to be certain about whether the complaints of abuse were true. My impression on all the evidence is that it was improbable, but that was not an issue to be resolved in this trial. Be that as it may, it may be readily understood how a grandparent with a genuine belief in the truth of such allegations may experience an overwhelming instinct to protect a grandchild. Sentencing courts have a duty to make clear that, even if such allegations are true, citizens may not take the law into their own hands. The potential for even greater tragedy if the allegations are untrue is obvious. When the plan to kill Mr Barker was formulated cannot be determined, but the statements and actions of Mr Jordan prior to the murder satisfy me that it was a course of action which was contemplated for some time. After Rachel Jordan separated from Mr Barker she began a relationship with Justin Titley. They lived at a large rural property called Brambletye. I accept the evidence of Justin Titley that not long before the murder Mr Jordan took a pump action firearm to Brambletye and test fired it. Mr Titley's evidence was strongly criticised by the accused. It was suggested that he had concocted this account much later when his relationship with Rachel Jordan was failing and to remove suspicion from himself. However I found him to be a believable witness and there was cogent evidence that he told another man about the test firing of the gun not long after the murder.

Mr Jordan is now aged 71. Mrs Jordan is about to turn 69. They were respectively 57 and 55 when the crime was committed. They led industrious and productive lives before retiring in 2002. They have assumed the responsibilities of care for children and, later, their parents. Neither has any prior convictions and it appears that both led blameless lives until the time of the murder. They pose little or no risk to anyone else. However, there is no indication of any remorse. Their guilt was only established after a very lengthy trial and following an extensive police investigation over more than a decade, to which countless hours of painstaking work and the allocation of enormous resources were devoted. Again, their denials and plea of not guilty do not add to the seriousness of the crime but demonstrate that they are not entitled to the

mitigation that co-operation with the authorities and a plea of guilty might have attracted. They are now in poor health. Mr Jordan has a serious back condition and a range of other health issues which require extensive medication. Mrs Jordan has a lifelong hip condition which has required multiple surgeries. She experiences pain and a lack of mobility. I would accept that for both, their ill-health will make prison more burdensome for them and may even result in a deterioration of their condition. There is necessarily a difference between the level of care they will obtain in prison and the level of care they may expect in the community. Mr and Mrs Jordan's age is a relevant sentencing factor. There is a chance that, even with allowance for parole, each may spend the whole or a substantial part of their remaining lives separated and in custody. As difficult as those considerations of health and age may be, they must be balanced with the need to impose a sentence which reflects the gravity of their crime and do not justify a sentence which is not fairly proportionate.

At the time of his death Mr Barker was aged 36. He held responsible employment with the local branch of a large agricultural supplies business. His death has had a profound and devastating impact on his parents, the other members of his immediate and extended family and his friends. I heard moving impact statements from his mother, his sister, brother and sister in law. His murder has, paradoxically, deprived his daughter of her father and that part of her extended family. Mr Barker was involved in community life. Many witnesses gave evidence that he was liked and respected. However when a court is imposing sentence, the qualities of the victim and the popularity or unpopularity of the victim are not factors of great significance. The law regards the principal consideration as being the sanctity of every human life.

Mr and Mrs Jordan were in custody between 11 May 2020 and their release on bail on 3 November 2020, on my calculations 177 days. The sentence will be backdated to take that period of custody into account. Eligibility for parole should only be permitted when they have served the minimum term of imprisonment the Court considers to be required. Account should be taken of their otherwise good character and record prior to the crime, and to their likely age when they may be released from prison.

Cedric Jordan and Noelene Jordan, you are each convicted of murder. You are each sentenced to imprisonment for 22 years from 2 January 2023. I order that you not be eligible for parole until you have 12 years of that term.