



HIGH COURT BULLETIN

Produced by the Legal Research Officer,
High Court of Australia Library
[2021] HCAB 5 (25 June 2021)

A record of recent High Court of Australia cases: decided, reserved for judgment, awaiting hearing in the Court's original jurisdiction, granted special leave to appeal, refused special leave to appeal and not proceeding or vacated

1: Summary of New Entries	1
2: Cases Handed Down	3
3: Cases Reserved	7
4: Original Jurisdiction	15
5: Section 40 Removal	16
6: Special Leave Granted.....	17
7: Cases Not Proceeding or Vacated.....	35
8: Special Leave Refused.....	36

1: SUMMARY OF NEW ENTRIES

2: Cases Handed Down

Case	Title
<i>Commonwealth of Australia v AJL20</i>	Constitutional Law
<i>LibertyWorks Inc v Commonwealth of Australia</i>	Constitutional Law
<i>Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs v Moorcroft</i>	Immigration
<i>Matthew Ward Price as Executor of the Estate of Alan Leslie Price (Deceased) & Ors v Christine Claire Spoor as Trustee & Ors</i>	Limitation of Actions

3: Cases Reserved

Case	Title
------	-------

<i>Palmer v The State of Western Australia; Mineralogy Pty Ltd & Anor v The State of Western Australia</i>	Constitutional Law
<i>Hamilton (a pseudonym) v The Queen</i>	Evidence
<i>Ridd v James Cook University</i>	Industrial Law
<i>Addy v Commissioner of Taxation</i>	Taxation

[4: Original Jurisdiction](#)

[5: Section 40 Removal](#)

[6: Special Leave Granted](#)

[7: Cases Not Proceeding or Vacated](#)

[8: Special Leave Refused](#)

2: CASES HANDED DOWN

The following cases were handed down by the High Court of Australia during the June 2021 sittings.

Constitutional Law

Commonwealth of Australia v AJL20
[C16/2020](#); [C17/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCA 21](#)

Judgment delivered: 23 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Constitutional law (Cth) – Immigration – Tort – False imprisonment – Where respondent "unlawful non-citizen" detained by Executive under ss 189(1) and 196(1) of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) – Whether period of executive detention authorised and required by ss 189(1) and 196(1) ceases when removal of "unlawful non-citizen" from Australia should have occurred had Executive acted with all reasonable despatch in performance of s 198(6) duty to remove, or continues until actual event of removal or grant of visa – Whether Parliament's power to authorise and require detention until actual event of removal or grant of visa limited by implications of Ch III of *Constitution* – Whether non-performance by Executive of statutory duties erases legitimate non-punitive statutory purposes which those duties support.

Words and phrases – "aliens", "deportation", "duty to remove", "exclusive vesting of the judicial power of the Commonwealth", "executive detention", "executive power", "executive purpose", "false imprisonment", "habeas corpus", "hedging duty", "judicial power", "lawful non-citizen", "legitimate non-punitive purposes", "Lim principle", "mandamus", "non-refoulement", "Parliamentary supremacy", "reading down", "removal", "remove as soon as reasonably practicable", "separation of powers", "statutory duty", "statutory purposes", "terminating events", "unlawful non-citizen", "visa".

Constitution – s 51(xix), Ch III.

Migration Act 1958 (Cth) – ss 4, 13, 14, 189, 196, 197C, 198.

Removed from Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia under s 40 of the Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth).

Held: Appeals allowed with costs.

[Return to Top](#)

LibertyWorks Inc v Commonwealth of Australia

[S10/2020: \[2021\] HCA 18](#)

Judgment delivered: 16 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Constitutional law (Cth) – Implied freedom of communication about governmental or political matters ("implied freedom") – Where *Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme Act 2018* (Cth) ("Act") included registration requirement for persons undertaking communications activity on behalf of foreign principal for purpose of political or governmental influence – Where foreign principal defined to include foreign political organisation – Where plaintiff undertook registrable activities on behalf of foreign political organisation in holding annual Conservative Political Action Conference events which constituted communications activity – Whether Act to extent it imposes registration obligations with respect to communications activity undertaken on behalf of foreign principal effectively burdens implied freedom – Whether provisions for legitimate purpose – Whether provisions suitable, necessary and adequate in balance.

Words and phrases – "adequate in its balance", "burden", "communications activity", "compelling justification", "disclosure", "foreign influence", "foreign interference", "foreign political organisation", "foreign principal", "legitimate purpose", "narrowly tailored", "necessary", "political or governmental influence", "prior restraint", "register", "registration", "scheme information", "structured proportionality", "suitable", "transparency", "undisclosed influence".

Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme Act 2018 (Cth) – ss 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 38, 42, 43, 45, 46, 52, 53.

Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme (Disclosure in Communications Activity) Rules 2018 (Cth).

Foreign Influence Transparency Scheme Rules 2018 (Cth) – s 6.

Special case referred for consideration by Full Court on 20 August 2020.

Held: Questions answered.

[Return to Top](#)

Immigration

Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs v Moorcroft

[B66/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCA 19](#)

Judgment delivered: 16 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Keane, Gordon, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Immigration – Visas – Application for special category visa – Where respondent's special category visa purportedly cancelled and respondent required to depart Australia in 2018 – Where purported cancellation decision subsequently quashed – Where respondent returned to Australia and refused a special category visa on the basis she was a "behaviour concern non-citizen" as defined in s 5(1) of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) ("Act") due to her removal in 2018 – Where s 5(1) of Act defined "behaviour concern non-citizen" in para (d) as a non-citizen who "has been removed or deported from Australia or removed or deported from another country" – Whether respondent was a "behaviour concern non-citizen" within meaning of para (d) – Whether "removed ... from Australia" means removed in fact or removed in accordance with Act.

Words and phrases – "behaviour concern non-citizen", "harsh consequences", "nullity", "removed", "removed or deported from", "theory of the second actor".

Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Cth) – s 18A.

Migration Act 1958 (Cth) – ss 5(1), 14, 32(2), Pt 2 Div 8.

Migration Regulations 1994 (Cth) – reg 5. 15A, Sch 1 item 1219, Sch 2 cl 444.511, Div 444.6.

Appealed from FCA: [\[2020\] FCA 382](#); (2020) 275 FCR 276

Held: Appeal allowed.

[Return to Top](#)

Limitation of Actions

Matthew Ward Price as Executor of the Estate of Alan Leslie Price (Deceased) & Ors v Christine Claire Spoor as Trustee & Ors

[B55/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCA 20](#)

Judgment delivered: 23 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Gordon, Edelman and Steward JJ

Catchwords:

Limitation of actions – Exclusion by agreement – Where mortgages over land secured loan – Where mortgagors failed to repay loan – Where mortgagees brought proceedings to recover monies owing and possession of land secured by mortgages – Where mortgagors contended mortgagees statute-barred from enforcing rights under mortgages as a result of expiry of relevant time period under *Limitation of Actions Act 1974* (Qld) ("Act") – Where mortgagors contended mortgagees' title under mortgages extinguished by operation of s 24 of Act – Where mortgagees contended that mortgagors agreed not to plead any defence under Act by virtue of cl 24 of mortgages – Whether cl 24 effective to prevent mortgagors from pleading any defence under Act – Whether agreement not to plead any defence under Act unenforceable as contrary to public policy – Whether s 24 of Act operated automatically to extinguish mortgagees' title at expiry of relevant time period – Whether mortgagees' remedy confined to damages for mortgagors' breach of cl 24 of mortgages.

Words and phrases – "action", "agreement", "agreement not to plead", "benefit", "breach of contract", "contracting out", "defeated", "defence", "defence of limitation", "expiry", "extinguishment of title", "finality of litigation", "jurisdiction of the court", "limitation period", "limitations defence", "plea", "public interest", "public policy", "reasonable business person", "remedy", "shall not be brought", "statute-barred", "statute of limitations", "statutory bar", "statutory right", "waiver".

Limitation of Actions Act 1974 (Qld) – ss 10, 13, 24, 26.

Appealed from QSC (CA): [\[2019\] QCA 297](#); (2019) 3 QR 176

Held: Appeal dismissed with costs.

[Return to Top](#)

3: CASES RESERVED

The following cases have been reserved or part heard by the High Court of Australia.

Constitutional Law

Chetcuti v Commonwealth of Australia

M122/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 82](#)

Date heard: 11 May 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Legislative power – Naturalisation and aliens – Where appellant entered Australia in 1948 – Where appellant was born in Malta and entered Australia as British subject – Where appellant became citizen of United Kingdom and Colonies in 1949 and citizen of Malta on 1961 – Whether within power of Commonwealth Parliament to treat appellant as alien within s 51(xix) of *Constitution* – Whether within power of Parliament to specify criteria for alienage – Whether appellant entered Australia as alien.

Appealed from HCA (Single Justice): [\[2020\] HCA 42](#); (2020) 95 ALJR 1; (2020) 385 ALR 1

[Return to Top](#)

Palmer v The State of Western Australia; Mineralogy Pty Ltd & Anor v The State of Western Australia

B52/2020; B54/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 104](#); [\[2021\] HCATrans 106](#); [\[2021\] HCATrans 107](#); [\[2021\] HCATrans 108](#)

Dates heard: 15-18 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – State legislative power – Federalism – Chapter III of *Constitution* – Where, on 5 December 2001, plaintiffs and

defendant entered into Agreement in relation to development of certain projects in Western Australia – Where Agreement ratified by *Iron Ore Processing (Minerology Pty Ltd) Agreement Act 2002* (WA) – Where Agreement subsequently varied in 2008 and ratified by *Iron Ore Processing (Minerology Pty Ltd) Agreement Amendment Act 2008* (WA) – Where various disputes arose in relation to development proposal and plaintiff claimed defendant breached terms of Agreement – Where disputes referred to arbitrator in Queensland – Where *Iron Ore Processing (Minerology Pty Ltd) Agreement Amendment Act 2020* (WA) enacted in 2020 – Where effect of 2020 Amendment Act to exclude defendant’s liability, and prohibit any enforcement or payment of any liability, arising in respect of disputes and arbitrations – Whether 2020 Amendment Act contravenes s 118 of *Constitution* by failure to give full faith and credit and effect to *Commercial Arbitration Act 2013* (Qld) and equivalent legislation in each State and Territory – Whether 2020 Amendment Act contravenes s 6 of *Australia Act 1986* (Cth) because not enacted pursuant to manner and form specified in Agreement - Whether 2020 Amendment Act purports to direct federal courts and courts exercising federal jurisdiction as to manner of exercise of federal jurisdiction, withdraws or limits federal jurisdiction, impermissibly interferes with federal court proceedings, or confers powers and duties repugnant to exercise of federal judicial power – Whether 2020 Amendment Act beyond state legislative power because violates rule of law – Whether 2020 Amendment Act incompatible with institutional integrity of courts – Whether 2020 Amendment Act impermissibly exercises state judicial power without possibility of review by courts – Whether 2020 Amendment Act invalid because alters consequences of actions and conduct of Commonwealth Government – Whether 2020 Amendment Act invalid under s 109 of *Constitution* – Whether 2020 Amending Act invalid for specifically targeting Mr Palmer and depriving him of personal rights and property rights – Whether 2020 Amendment Act involves abdication of State legislative power – Whether 2020 Amendment Act contravenes s 117 of *Constitution* by discriminating against Mr Palmer as resident of Queensland – Whether 2020 Amendment Act invalid in entirety or in part.

Special case referred to the Full Court on 6 April 2021.

[Return to Top](#)

Criminal Law

Director of Public Prosecutions Reference No 1 of 2019

[M131/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 86](#)

Date heard: 14 May 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Mental element – Recklessness – Where Victorian Court of Appeal in *R v Campbell* [1997] 2 VR 585 held that “recklessness” requires foresight of probability of consequence – Where High Court in *Aubrey v The Queen* (2017) 260 CLR 305 held that “recklessness” for offences other than murder requires foresight of possibility of consequence – Where reference arose from trial in which accused acquitted of recklessly causing serious injury, contrary to s 17 of *Crimes Act 1958* (Vic) – Where Court of Appeal concluded nothing in *Aubrey* compelled reconsideration of *Campbell* – Where Court of Appeal held correct interpretation of “recklessness” requires foresight of “probability” of serious injury – Whether, in Victoria, correct interpretation of “recklessness” for offences not resulting in death is foresight of the “possibility” of serious injury – Whether principle in *Campbell* should be followed.

Appealed from VSC (CA): [\[2020\] VSCA 181](#); (2020) 284 A Crim R 19

[Return to Top](#)

Edwards v The Queen

S235/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 89](#)

Date heard: 19 May 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Keane, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Prosecution’s duty of disclosure – Where appellant charged with sexual offences against child – Where appellant’s mobile phone seized and contents downloaded – Where prosecution disclosed existence of download and offered to provide appellant with copy of downloaded data – Where data not provided to appellant – Where prosecution did not disclose relevance of download data – Where prosecution case on two counts relied on evidence of complainant – Where defence case on same counts relied on documentary evidence contradicting complainant’s evidence – Where NSW Court of Criminal Appeal (“CCA”) dismissed appeal against conviction – Whether prosecutor breached duty of disclosure by not providing download data to appellant, contrary to s 142 of *Criminal Procedure Act 1987* (NSW) – Whether CCA erred in concluding verdicts on two counts not unreasonable as there remained reasonable doubt as to existence of opportunity for offending to have occurred.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2020\] NSWCCA 57](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Defamation

Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd v Voller; Nationwide News Pty Limited v Voller; Australian News Channel Pty Ltd v Voller
[S236/2020; S237/2020; S238/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 88](#)

Date heard: 18 May 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Defamation – Publication – Where appellants created and operated public Facebook pages on which Facebook users can view and comment on items posted – Where Facebook users posted comments on appellants’ Facebook posts – Where respondent commenced defamation proceedings against appellants’ – Where primary judge determined separate question – Where NSW Court of Appeal dismissed appeal from determination – Whether intention to communicate defamatory material is necessary for person to be “publisher” – Whether operators of Facebook pages “publish” third-party comments posted on page prior to being aware of comments.

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2020\] NSWCA 102](#); (2020) 380 ALR 700

[Return to Top](#)

Evidence

Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v Shi
[S211/2020](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 69](#)

Date heard: 14 April 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Gordon, Edelman and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Evidence – Exceptions to privilege against self-incrimination – *Evidence Act 1995* (Cth) s 128A – Where appellant commenced proceedings against respondent and two others seeking satisfaction of tax liabilities – Where appellant sought freezing orders with

respect to respondent's assets – Where Federal Court made *ex parte* freezing orders in relation to respondent's worldwide assets – Where respondent also ordered to file and serve affidavit disclosing worldwide assets – Where respondent filed two affidavits, one which was served on appellant, and one which was delivered to Federal Court in sealed envelope – Where respondent claimed privilege against self-incrimination in respect of second affidavit, invoking s 128A – Where prior to hearing of privilege claim, judgment entered for appellant in sum of \$42,297,437.65 – Where primary judge accepted reasonable grounds for respondent's claim for privilege against self-incrimination, but considered not in interests of justice that certificate be granted pursuant to s 128A(7), with consequence that appellant did not get access to second affidavit – Where majority of Full Court of Federal Court held primary judge erred in certain respects, but dismissed appeal – Whether availability of mechanism to compulsorily examine respondent as judgment debtor relevant to determining whether in interests of justice to grant s 128A certificate – Whether risk of derivative use of privileged information in event that s 128A certificate granted should have been taken into account when determining whether in interests of justice to grant certificate.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 100](#); (2020) 277 FCR 1; (2020) 380 ALR 226

[Return to Top](#)

Hamilton (a pseudonym) v The Queen

S24/2021: [\[2021\] HCA Trans 109](#)

Date heard: 22 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Keane, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Evidence – Tendency evidence – Jury directions – Where appellant charged with ten counts of aggravated indecent assault against three separate complainants – Where trial judge ruled evidence from complainants admissible but not cross-admissible for tendency purposes – Where anti-tendency direction not given – Where Court of Criminal Appeal held anti-tendency direction not necessary as appellant had not established risk of jury engaging in tendency reasoning – Where Court of Criminal Appeal found defence counsel made deliberate decision not to request anti-tendency direction to obtain forensic advantage – Whether anti-tendency direction generally be given in multi-complainant trial – Whether miscarriage of justice occasioned by failure to direct jury it was prohibited from using evidence led in support of each count as tendency evidence in support of other counts.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2020\] NSWCCA 80](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Industrial Law

Ridd v James Cook University
B12/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 110](#)

Date heard: 23 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon and Edelman JJ

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Enterprise agreement – Where appellant employed as professor by respondent under James Cook University Enterprise Agreement (“EA”) – Where EA cl 14 protected right to intellectual freedom and specified limits – Where respondent has Code of Conduct and in cl 13, parties to EA expressed commitment to Code – Where cl 54 provided disciplinary action could only be taken for “misconduct” or “serious misconduct” – Where “serious misconduct” included breach of Code – Where respondent took disciplinary action against appellant on basis appellant breached Code by failure to act in collegial manner and to uphold integrity and good reputation of respondent – Where appellant successfully brought proceedings in Federal Circuit Court alleging respondent contravened EA because he could not be disciplined for conduct protected under cl 14 – Where respondent successfully appealed to Full Court of the Federal Court – Whether appellant’s conduct protected by cl 14 – Whether, on proper construction of EA, cl 14, 13 and Code should be read together – If so, whether cl 13 qualifies cl 14 or vice versa.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 123](#); (2020) 278 FCR 566; (2020) 382 ALR 8; (2020) 298 IR 50

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 132](#)

[Return to Top](#)

WorkPac Pty Ltd v Rossato & Ors
B73/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 83](#); [\[2021\] HCATrans 84](#)

Date heard: 12-13 May 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Characterisation as “casual employee” – Restitution – Where *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) contained National Employment Standards (NES) – Where NES provided that permanent employees entitled to certain leave entitlements – Where first respondent employed under contract describing him as “casual employee” – Where first respondent employed for indefinite period with regular and predictable shifts – Where first respondent’s hours set far in advance and not given option to elect not to work particular shifts – Where first respondent paid casual loading in lieu of leave entitlements – Where appellant sought declarations that first respondent not entitled to leave – Where Full Court of Federal Court dismissed application – Whether first respondent “casual employee” for the purposes of *Fair Work Act* or enterprise agreement – If not, whether appellant is entitled to apply casual loading paid to first respondent in satisfaction of his leave entitlements by way of set-off, restitution or by reg 2.03A of *Fair Work Regulations 2009* (Cth).

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 84](#); (2020) 278 FCR 179; (2020) 296 IR 38; (2020) 378 ALR 585

[Return to Top](#)

Taxation

Addy v Commissioner of Taxation

S25/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 111](#)

Date heard: 24 June 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Gordon, Edelman and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Taxation – Double taxation treaty – Non-discrimination clause – Where Art 25 of Australia and United Kingdom Double Taxation Treaty provides foreign nationals shall not be subjected to more burdensome tax treatment compared to hypothetical Australian national in same circumstances – Where appellant citizen of United Kingdom and holder of working holiday visa – Where working holiday visa-holders subject to special working holiday tax rate in Pt III of Sch 7 of *Income Tax Rates Act 1986* (Cth) – Where appellant taxed \$3,986 compared to \$1,591.44 by Australian national on same income – Where appellant selected as test case by respondent Commissioner – Where Federal Court held appellant

entitled to benefit of Art 25 – Where respondent successfully appealed to Full Court – Whether appellant subject to more burdensome taxation by reason of nationality – If so, whether appellant Australian resident for tax purposes.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 135](#); (2020) 382 ALR 68

[Return to Top](#)

4: ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

The following cases are ready for hearing in the original jurisdiction of the High Court of Australia.

Immigration

Plaintiff M1/2021 v Minister for Home Affairs

M1/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 52](#)

Catchwords:

Immigration – Judicial review – Non-refoulement obligations – Where plaintiff granted Refugee and Humanitarian (Class XB) Subclass 202 (Global Special Humanitarian) visa in 2006 – Where, on 19 September 2017, plaintiff convicted of unlawful assault and sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment – Where, on 27 October 2017, delegate of Minister cancelled plaintiff's visa pursuant to s 501(3A) of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) – Where plaintiff made representations to Minister regarding possibility of refoulement if plaintiff returned to home country – Where, on 9 August 2018, delegate of Minister decided not to revoke cancellation decision pursuant to s 501CA(4) of *Migration Act* – Where, in making decision, delegate did not consider whether non-refoulement obligations owed to plaintiff because plaintiff able to apply for protection visa under *Migration Act* – Whether delegate required to consider plaintiff's representations concerning non-refoulement obligations in making non-revocation decision pursuant to s 501CA(4) where plaintiff can apply for protection visa – If so, whether delegate failed to consider representations – If so, whether delegate failed to exercise jurisdiction under *Migration Act* or denied plaintiff procedural fairness – Whether non-revocation decision affected by jurisdictional error.

Special case referred to the Full Court on 30 March 2021.

[Return to Top](#)

5: SECTION 40 REMOVAL

The following cases are ready for hearing in the original jurisdiction of the High Court of Australia.

[Return to Top](#)

6: SPECIAL LEAVE GRANTED

The following cases have been granted special leave to appeal to the High Court of Australia.

Administrative Law

Sunland Group Limited & Anor v Gold Coast City Council

B64/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 61](#)

Date heard: 9 April 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Keane, Gordon, Steward and Gleeson JJ

Catchwords:

Administrative law – Planning and environment – Development approvals – Where in 2015 second appellant bought parcel of undeveloped land which carried with it benefit of preliminary development approval granted in 2007 – Where preliminary approval approved multi-stage residential development subject to 56 conditions – Where some conditions provided for payment of infrastructure contributions to respondent – Where preliminary approval made under *Integrated Planning Act 1997* (Qld) – Where *Integrated Planning Act* replaced by other legislation – Whether conditions concerning infrastructure contributions, properly construed, should be read as binding on appellant or landowner, or merely as statements as to scope of future possible conditions – Whether, in construction of conditions, *contra proferentem* rule applies so that ambiguities are to be resolved against approving authority.

Appealed from QSC (CA): [\[2020\] QCA 89](#)

Hearing adjourned.

[Return to Top](#)

Aviation

Wells Fargo Trust Company, National Association (As Owner Trustee) & Anor v VB Leaseco Pty Ltd (Administrators Appointed) & Ors

S60/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 63](#)

Date heard: 12 April 2021 – *Special leave granted.*

Catchwords:

Aviation – Construction of art XI *Protocol to the Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters Specific to Aircraft Equipment* (Protocol) – Where *International Interest in Mobile Equipment (Cape Town Convention) Act 2013* (Cth) gives domestic effect to *Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment (Cape Town Convention)* – Where art XI(2) of Protocol provides upon occurrence of insolvency-related event, insolvency administrator or debtor shall “give possession of the aircraft object” to creditor – Where appellants owners of aircraft engines leased to first respondent and subleased to second and fourth respondents – Where third respondent appointed administrator of other respondents following insolvency-related event – Where lease imposes on lessees return obligations in respect of aircraft – Where appellants sought compliance with respondents’ Art XI(2) obligations to “give possession” – Where third respondent, instead of physically redelivering engines, issued a notice under s 443B(3) of *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) disclaiming leased engines and leaving engines still attached to aircraft operated by lessees and owned by third parties – Where primary judge held respondents failed to “give possession” of engines – Where respondents successfully appealed to Full Court Federal Court – Whether “give possession” means physical delivery of aircraft objects or merely enables creditor to exercise self-help remedy – Whether respondents failed to “give possession”.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 168](#); (2020) 279 FCR 518; (2020) 384 ALR 378

[Return to Top](#)

Competition Law

Port of Newcastle Operations Pty Limited v Glencore Coal Assets Australia Pty Ltd & Ors

S33/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 42](#)

Date heard: 12 March 2021 – *Special leave granted.*

Catchwords:

Competition law – Arbitration determination – Third party access – Calculation of user contributions – Where appellant operator of Port of Newcastle – Where provision of access and use of Port shipping channels declared service pursuant to Pt IIIA of *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) – Where appellant levies certain charges payable by vessel owner or charterer in respect of use of Port

infrastructure – Where first respondent coal mining company exported coal through Port via both own chartered vessels and vessels owned by other persons – Where first respondent sought arbitration by Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (“ACCC”) of dispute about quantum of charge – Where ACCC and Australian Competition Tribunal on review determined first respondent could not arbitrate terms on which other persons’ vessels carrying first respondent’s coal were charged – Where parties agreed ACCC use “depreciated optimised replacement cost methodology” to calculate asset base component of appropriate charge – Where ACCC and Tribunal on review decided s 44X(1)(e) required it to deduct historical service user contributions to Port infrastructure from asset base in calculation of charge – Where appellant unsuccessfully appealed to Full Court of Federal Court – Whether persons with economic interest in arbitration determination or who causes access to occur are third party for purposes of Pt IIIA – Proper approach to calculation of historical user contributions in charge.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 145](#); (2020) 382 ALR 331

[Return to Top](#)

Contracts

Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd v Clarence City Council & Anor; Australia Pacific Airports (Launceston) Pty Ltd v Northern Midlands Council & Anor

[H2/2021; H3/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 26](#)

Date heard: 12 February 2021 – *Special leave granted.*

Catchwords:

Contracts – Privity of contract – Declaratory relief – Where second respondent Commonwealth registered proprietor of land leased to appellants – Where first respondent Councils not party to lease – Where cl 26.2(a) of lease provides amount equivalent to council rates to be paid to first respondents in respect of leased land – Where lease contemplates that first respondents will participate in mechanism in determining amount payable – Where dispute arose between appellants and first respondents as to amounts payable – Where first respondents sought declaratory and consequential relief with respect to proper construction of cl 26.2(a) – Where primary judge held first respondents did not have standing to seek declaratory relief on basis of privity of contract – Where first respondents successfully appealed to Full Federal Court, which held doctrine of privity only prevents third parties from obtaining executory judgment to enforce terms of contract, not declaratory

judgment – Whether doctrine of privity prevents third parties from seeking declaratory relief – Whether third parties have standing to seek declaratory relief in respect of contract.

Constitutional law – Judicial power of Commonwealth – Requirement for a “matter” – Jurisdiction of Federal Court – Where there is no dispute between contracting parties as to interpretation of contract – Whether first respondents have rights, duties or liabilities to be established by determination of a court – Whether there is a justiciable controversy or enforceable right, duty or liability to found a “matter”.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 134](#); (2020) 382 ALR 273

[Return to Top](#)

Corporations

Walton & Anor v ACN 004 410 833 Ltd (formerly Arrium Ltd) (in liquidation) & Ors

S20/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 18](#)

Date heard: 11 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Corporations – Examinations relating to insolvency – Abuse of process – Where s 596A of *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) requires court to issue examinations summons to a person about a company if “eligible applicant” applies for summons – Where “eligible applicants” include persons authorised by Australian Securities and Investments Commission (“ASIC”) – Where ASIC can only authorise person if person’s purpose is for benefit of corporation, its contributories or its creditors – Where appellants shareholders of respondent – Where, in 2014, respondent successfully completed capital raising for purpose of paying down debt – Where respondent entered into voluntary administration in 2016 and liquidation in 2019 – Where ASIC authorised appellants as “eligible applicants” to conduct examinations of respondent’s directors and officers – Where NSW Court of Appeal found appellants’ predominant purpose investigation and pursuit of shareholders’ private claim against directors in relation to 2014 capital raising – Where Court of Appeal held fulfilment of that purpose would not confer benefit on corporation, creditors or contributories, and therefore offensive to purpose for which s 596A enacted and abuse of process – Whether implicit purpose of obtaining information about potential misconduct is beneficial to corporation – Whether appellants’ purposes offensive or foreign to s 596A.

Appealed from NSW (CA): [\[2020\] NSWCA 157](#); (2020) 383 ALR 298; (2020) 17 ABC(NS) 320

[Return to Top](#)

Criminal Law

Bell v State of Tasmania

H2/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 5](#)

Date heard: 3 February 2021

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Keane, Edelman and Steward JJ

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Defences – Honest and reasonable mistake – Where appellant charged with one count of rape and one count of supply of controlled drug to child – Where trial judge left defence of honest and reasonable mistake as to age in relation to rape charge – Where counsel for appellant requested similar direction in respect of supply charge – Where trial judge refused to make such direction on basis that defence of honest and reasonable mistake as to age would not relieve appellant of criminal responsibility with respect to supply charge – Where jury convicted appellant of supply charge but could not reach verdict on rape or alternative charge of sexual intercourse with person under age of 17 – Where at retrial of sexual offence jury found appellant not guilty of rape but convicted on alternative charge – Where Court of Criminal Appeal upheld trial judge’s decision that defence of honest and reasonable mistake as to age not available in relation to supply charge – Whether defence of honest and reasonable mistake of fact only available where its successful use would lead to defendant not being guilty of any crime.

Appealed from TASSC (CCA): [\[2019\] TASCRA 19](#); (2019) 279 A Crim R 553

Hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed to notify State and Territory Attorneys-General of the appeal and allow the opportunity to intervene.

[Return to Top](#)

George v The State of Western Australia

P45/2020: [\[2021\] HCATrans 95](#)

Date heard: 20 May 2021 – *Application referred to Full Court for argument as on appeal*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Jury directions – Right to silence – Where applicant charged with indecently dealing with child between ages 13 and 16 years, contrary to s 321(4) of *Criminal Code* (WA) – Where prosecution adduced evidence of investigating police officer, who gave evidence of electronic record of interview in which applicant denied offences and gave alternative account, and tendered record of interview – Where applicant did not give or adduce any evidence at trial – Where applicant submitted prosecution had not proved beyond reasonable doubt all elements of offence – Where trial judge failed to warn jury that applicant's silence could not be used as evidence against him, does not constitute admission, could not be used to fill gaps in prosecution's evidence and could not be used as a make-weight in assessing whether prosecution proved case beyond reasonable doubt (*Azzopardi* direction) – Where majority of WA Court of Appeal held absence of *Azzopardi* direction not miscarriage of justice – Whether miscarriage of justice occurred because of absence of *Azzopardi* direction.

Appealed from WASC (CA): [\[2020\] WASCA 139](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Hofer v The Queen

S37/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 44](#)

Date heard: 12 March 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Criminal procedure – Conduct of cross-examination – Where appellant charged with 11 counts of having sexual intercourse without consent – Where two complainants testified as prosecution witnesses – Where appellant gave evidence – Where, during cross-examination, prosecutor asked appellant about aspects of his evidence arising from defence counsel's failure to comply with *Browne v Dunn* rule in respect of those matters in cross-examination of complainants – Where prosecutor suggested appellant lying in evidence about those matters because defence counsel had not put those matters to complainants – Where defence counsel did not object to prosecutor's questions – Where appellant convicted and unsuccessfully appealed to NSW Court of Criminal Appeal – Whether prosecutor able to cross-examine accused with regard to defence counsel's non-compliance with rule in *Browne v Dunn* – Whether prosecutor engaged in impermissible questioning – Whether defence counsel at trial incompetent – Whether trial miscarried.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2019\] NSWCCA 244](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Orreal v The Queen

B25/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 71](#)

Date heard: 16 April 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Application of proviso – Substantial miscarriage of justice – Prejudicial evidence – Where appellant charged with sexual offending against child – Where, at trial, irrelevant, inadmissible and prejudicial medical evidence placed before jury – Where prosecution, in summing up, contended evidence could be of some use to jury – Where trial judge did not direct jury to disregard inadmissible evidence and directed jury could use evidence – Where appellant unsuccessfully appealed to Court of Appeal – Where majority of Court of Appeal held, despite reception of inadmissible and prejudicial evidence, no substantial miscarriage of justice occurred – Whether, in cases turning on issues of contested credibility, appropriate for intermediate Court of Appeal to make own assessment of admissible evidence for purpose of determining whether no substantial miscarriage of justice occurred.

Appealed from QSC (CA): [\[2020\] QCA 95](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Park v The Queen

S61/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 75](#)

Date heard: 16 April 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Sentencing – Guilty plea reduction - Where s 22(1) of *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999* (NSW) provides that, in passing sentence on offender who has pleaded guilty to offence, court may impose lesser penalty “than it would otherwise have imposed” – Where appellant pleaded guilty to offence – Where offence has 5 year maximum penalty but jurisdictional limit of 2 years applies when dealt with summarily by District Court – Where primary judge would have imposed sentence of 2 years 8 months for offence and applied 25 per cent reduction to sentence pursuant to s 22(1) – Where appellant sentenced to 2 years imprisonment – Where appellant appealed to Court of Criminal Appeal on basis reduction should have been applied to 2 years (jurisdictional limit

applied to appropriate sentence) instead of 2 years 8 months (appropriate sentence before jurisdictional limit applied) - Where Court of Criminal Appeal dismissed appeal and held "would otherwise have imposed" refers to appropriate sentence despite jurisdictional limit, and jurisdictional limit only relevant if sentence post-reduction exceeds jurisdictional limit – Correct construction of "would otherwise have imposed" – Whether reduction of sentence applies to sentence appropriate to judicial officer but beyond jurisdictional limit or to sentence court would actually have imposed if no guilty plea.

Appealed from NSW (CCA): [\[2020\] NSWCCA 90](#); (2020) 282 A Crim R 551

[Return to Top](#)

Equity

Stubbings v Jams 2 Pty Ltd & Ors

M13/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 23](#)

Date heard: 12 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Equity – Unconscionable conduct – Wilful blindness – Where appellant borrowed from respondent lenders secured only on appellant's assets – Where appellant without regular income and defaulted – Where respondents' system of asset-based lending included deliberate intention to avoid receipt of information about personal and financial circumstances of borrower or guarantor – Where certificate of independent financial advice given in respect of transaction – Where respondents brought proceedings for possession of appellant's assets – Where primary judge found respondents wilfully blind and had actual knowledge as to appellant's personal and financial circumstances – Where respondents successfully appealed to Court of Appeal, which overturned primary judge's findings as to knowledge – Whether lender's conduct unconscionable by engaging in system of asset-based lending without receipt of information about personal or financial situation of borrower, or alternatively, wilfully or recklessly failing to make such enquiries an honest and reasonable person would make – Whether Court of Appeal entitled to overturn findings of primary judge as to respondents' knowledge.

Appealed from VSC (CA): [\[2020\] VSCA 200](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Family Law

Charisteas v Charisteas & Ors

[P6/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 28](#)

Date determined: 12 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Family law – Appeals – Apprehension of bias – Where parties involved in protracted proceedings since 2008, including two trials in Family Court of Western Australia where orders were set aside by Full Court of Family Court of Australia – Where primary judge in third trial engaged in undisclosed communication and personal contact with then-counsel for respondent prior to commencement of trial and after judgment reserved but before judgment delivered – Where fact but not full details of communication subsequently disclosed after appellant became aware of relationship between primary judge and respondent counsel – Where appellant unsuccessfully applied to have judge recused and unsuccessfully appealed to Full Court – Where Full Court held hypothetical observer would not have reasonable apprehension of bias because would accept judge may have mistaken views about propriety of private communications after judgment reserved but before judgment delivered and would tolerate some amount of private communication – Whether hypothetical observer would have reasonable apprehension of bias from failure to disclose communications between primary judge and respondent counsel.

Family law – Practice and procedure – Powers under s 79 of *Family Court Act 1975* (Cth) (“Act”) – Where, in 2011 trial judgment, primary judge made final orders under s 79 – Where some orders set aside without remitter by 2013 appeal to Full Court – Where primary judge in third trial made 2015 interlocutory interpretation decision that power to make orders under s 79 not exhausted – Where primary judge made orders in 2017 varying 2011 orders – Where Full Court held primary judge had power to vary or set aside 2011 orders – Whether, when orders made in exercise of statutory power and some set aside on appeal without remittal or rehearing, power under s 79 is exhausted – Whether primary judge acting in excess of jurisdiction – Whether appellant waived right to challenge exercise of power because did not appeal 2015 interpretation decision.

Appealed from FamCA (FC): [\[2020\] FamCAFC 162](#); (2020) 354 FLR 167; (2020) 60 Fam LR 483

[Return to Top](#)

Immigration

Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs v Viane

[S34/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 46](#)

Date determined: 12 March 2021 – *Special leave granted on conditions*

Catchwords:

Immigration – Judicial review – No evidence – Where respondent's visa mandatorily cancelled under s 501(3A) of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) – Where respondent made representations pursuant to s 501CA as to why cancellation should be revoked – Where, if visa cancellation not revoked, respondent and family would be removed to Samoa or American Samoa – Where Minister decided not to revoke cancellation decision – Where respondent unsuccessfully appealed to Federal Court and successfully appealed to Full Court – Whether Minister made factual findings regarding language and availability of welfare and social services in Samoa and American Samoa without evidence – Whether Minister made factual findings based on personal or specialised knowledge about Samoa or American Samoa – If not, whether errors material and jurisdictional.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 144](#); (2020) 278 FCR 386

[Return to Top](#)

Industrial Law

Australian Building and Construction Commissioner v Pattinson & Anor

[M34/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 90](#)

Date determined: 20 May 2021 – *Special leave granted on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Civil penalties – Determination of appropriate penalty – Where s 349(1) of *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) provided unlawful for person to knowingly or recklessly make false or misleading representation about another person's obligation to engage in industrial activity – Where second respondent union had "no ticket no start" policy and respondents carried out policy by representing to two workers they could not work unless joined

union – Where respondents admitted liability for two contraventions of s 349(1) – Where second respondent well-resourced and, since 2000, had breached pecuniary penalty provisions on more than 150 occasions, including at least 15 occasions involving “no ticket no start” policy and 7 previous contraventions of s 349(1) – Where primary judge considered statutory maximum penalty required to sufficiently deter respondents in light of previous contraventions and imposed maximum – Where respondents appealed to Full Federal Court, which held maximum penalty must only be imposed for most serious and grave contravening conduct and imposed lower penalty – Whether statutory maximum penalty must only be imposed for most serious and grave contravening conduct – Whether statutory maximum penalty can be imposed if necessary to deter contravening conduct.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 177](#); (2020) 384 ALR 75; (2020) 299 IR 404

[Return to Top](#)

Construction, Forestry, Maritime, Mining and Energy Union & Anor v Personnel Contracting Pty Ltd
P5/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 30](#)

Date determined: 12 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Employee and independent contractor – Proper test for distinguishing – Labour hire agreement – Definition of “employee” –Where second appellant signed Administrative Services Agreement with respondent labour hire agency and offered work cleaning and moving materials for builder – Where contract between second appellant and respondent for work, contract between respondent and builder for labour supply, but no contract between second appellant and respondent – Where builder “controlled” second appellant – Where arrangement of casual nature included right to reject assignment – Where second appellant not integrated into respondent’s business and not given uniform – Where work required personal service and second appellant not in business on own account – Where second appellant 22-year old backpacker on working holiday visa – Where express term of contract categorises relationship not employment – Where appellants allege respondent contravened various National Employment Standards and s 45 of *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) by not paying second appellant in accordance with relevant award – Where Standards apply only if second appellant “employee” – Where primary judge, applying multi-factorial test, found second appellant not employee – Where Full Court preferred approach second appellant employee but for authority of intermediate appellate court

in *Personnel Contracting v Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union* [2004] WASCA 312 decided in similar circumstances, which Full Court held not plainly wrong – Whether second appellant “employee” of respondent – Whether, in triangular labour hire agreement, control test satisfied when second appellant controlled by builder and not respondent – Whether multi-factorial test correctly applied.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 122](#); (2020) 279 FCR 631; (2020) 381 ALR 457; (2020) 297 IR 269

[Return to Top](#)

NSW Commissioner of Police v Cottle & Anor
S56/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 62](#)

Date heard: 12 April 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Jurisdiction of Industrial Relations Commission of New South Wales (IRC) – Police – Where appellant made decision under s 72A of *Police Act 1990* (NSW) to retire first respondent police officer on medical grounds – Where first respondent applied for unfair dismissal remedy in IRC under s 84 of *Industrial Relations Act 1996* (NSW) – Where *Police Act* does not expressly provide for review by IRC for medical retirement but does for other types of removal – Where appellant successfully challenged IRC’s jurisdiction, following High Court’s decision in *Commissioner for Police for NSW v Eaton* (2013) 252 CLR 1 – Where Full Bench overturned decision – Where appellant successfully sought judicial review of Full Bench decision by NSW Supreme Court – Where first respondent successfully appealed to Court of Appeal – Whether IRC has jurisdiction to hear and determine unfair dismissal application filed by police officer retired on medical grounds – Whether Court of Appeal applied correct statutory construction principles in interpreting two overlapping statutory schemes.

Appealed from NSW (CA): [\[2020\] NSWCA 159](#); (2020) 298 IR 202

[Return to Top](#)

ZG Operations Australia Pty Ltd & Anor v Jamsek & Ors
S27/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 27](#)

Date heard: 12 February 2021 – *Special leave granted on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Employee and contractor – Proper test for distinguishing – Multi-factorial test – Where respondents commenced employment with appellants as truck drivers in 1980 – Where, in 1985, appellants and respondents agreed respondents would become contractors – Where respondents formed partnerships with respective wives, purchased truck from appellants and executed written contract with appellants to provide delivery services – Where respondents worked exclusively for and derived sole income from appellants for nearly forty years, and contract expressly permitted respondents to service other clients – Where respondents required to be available to work during set hours – Where impractical for respondents to work for or generate goodwill with other clients – Where respondents required to purchase truck to retain work, display company logo on truck and wear branded clothing – Where respondents responsible for upkeep, maintenance and insurance of trucks – Where respondents paid by invoice and charged GST to appellants – Where respondents conducted partnerships as one would expect of business – Where contract terminated in 2017 – Where respondents unsuccessfully claimed in Federal Court for unpaid employee entitlements under various statutory regimes and Federal Court held respondents “contractors” – Where respondents successfully appealed to Full Court, which held respondents “employees” – Whether respondents “employees” for purposes of *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth), *Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act 1992* (Cth) and “workers” for purpose of *Long Service Leave Act 1955* (NSW).

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 119](#); (2020) 279 FCR 114; (2020) 297 IR 210

[Return to Top](#)

Patents

H. Lundbeck A/S & Anor v Sandoz Pty Ltd; CNS Pharma Pty Ltd v Sandoz Pty Ltd

[S22/2021](#); [S23/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 13](#)

Date heard: 11 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Patents – Patent extension – Contract construction – Where s 79 of *Patents Act 1990* (Cth) provides if patentee applies for extension of term of patent and patent expires before application determined and extension is granted, patentee has same rights to commence infringement proceedings during extension period as if extension had been granted when alleged infringement was done – Where

appellants patentee and exclusive licensees of pharmaceutical compound – Where patent expired in 13 June 2009 – Where, on 25 June 2014, patent extension granted to 9 December 2012 – Where, from 15 June 2009 onwards, respondent supplied generic version of compound – Where, in 2007, patentee and respondent entered into Settlement Agreement, giving respondent licence to exploit patent prior to expiry – Where Agreement specified possible commencement dates of licence conditioned on whether extension granted, but did not specify end date – Where appellants commenced infringement proceedings in Federal Court on 26 June 2014 in respect of acts done during extension period – Where Federal Court held Agreement gave licence only for two weeks prior to original expiry date (31 May 2009) until original expiry (13 June 2009) but not extension period – Where respondent successfully appealed to Full Court, which held Agreement gave licence from 31 May 2009 to extended expiry date (9 December 2012) – Whether licence applied in relation to acts occurring after patent original expiry date and before term extended – Whether, on respondent's construction, Agreement produced commercially nonsensical result – Whether exclusive licensee may commence infringement proceeding for acts done between original date of expiry and date on which term subsequently extended.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 133](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Practice and Procedure

Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v Huang

S26/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 21](#)

Date determined: 11 February 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Practice and procedure – Freezing order – Where appellant filed originating application in Federal Court seeking judgment against respondent – Where appellant obtained *ex parte* worldwide freezing order against respondent's Australian and foreign assets pursuant to r 7.32 of *Federal Court Rules 2011* (Cth) – Where respondent holds significant assets in China and Hong Kong – Where prospective judgment obtained against respondent not likely to be enforceable in China or Hong Kong – Where judgment subsequently entered against respondent – Where respondent successfully appealed to Full Court against freezing order on ground freezing order requires realistic possibility any judgment obtained by appellant can be enforced against respondent's assets in relevant foreign jurisdiction – Whether r 7.32 imposes mandatory

jurisdictional precondition on appellant to prove realistic possibility of enforcement in relevant foreign jurisdiction – Whether, absent realistic possibility, disposition of respondent’s foreign assets would frustrate or inhibit Federal Court processes and create danger of judgment being wholly or partly unsatisfied.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 141](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Taxation

Commissioner of Taxation v Carter & Ors
S62/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 72](#)

Date heard: 16 April 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Taxation – Trust distribution – Effect of disclaimer – Where respondents default beneficiaries of trust – Where trust deed provided respondents entitled to income of trust for given tax year (ending 30 June) if trustee did not make effective determination departing from default position – Where trustee had not made effective determination as at 30 June 2014 – Where s 97(1) of *Income Tax Assessment Act 1936* (Cth) provides if beneficiary of trust is “presently entitled” to share of trust income, that share included in assessable income of beneficiary – Where, following audit, on 27 September 2015, appellant issued income tax assessments to respondents for income year ended 30 June 2014 including their share of 2014 trust income – On 30 September 2016, respondents purported to disclaim entitlement to income from trust for 2014 income year – Where Full Court of Federal Court considered themselves bound to hold general law extinguishes entitlement to trust income ab initio and held disclaimers displaced application of s 97(1) – Whether disclaimer of gift render gift void ab initio for all purposes – Whether, if beneficiary disclaims trust distribution after end of income year, beneficiary “presently entitled” to distribution for purposes of s 97(1).

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2020\] FCAFC 150](#); (2020) 279 FCR 83

[Return to Top](#)

Torts

Arsalan v Rixon; Nguyen v Cassim
[S35/2021; S36/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 43](#)

Date heard: 12 March 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Torts – Damages – Damage to chattel – Where appellants' negligence resulted in motor vehicle collision with respondents' "high-value", "prestige" vehicles – Where respondents' vehicles damaged, and respondents hired replacement vehicles of equivalent value while damaged vehicles underwent repairs – Where respondents claimed damages for cost of hiring replacement vehicles of equivalent value in NSW Local Court – Where magistrate awarded damages only for cost of hiring suitable replacement vehicle for uses vehicle will likely to be put, not necessarily of equivalent value – Where respondents' appeal to Supreme Court dismissed – Where respondents' appeal to Court of Appeal allowed – Where Court of Appeal majority held damages be awarded to put claimant in position they would have been in before wrongdoing, i.e., for replacement vehicle of equivalent value – Where each judge in Court of Appeal applied different standard – Whether respondents entitled to claim damages for cost of hiring replacement vehicles of equivalent value to damaged prestige vehicles – Whether equivalent value replacement vehicle reasonable – Correct test of quantification of damages.

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2020\] NSWCA 115](#); (2020) 92 MVR 366

[Return to Top](#)

Kozarov v State of Victoria
[M36/2021](#): [\[2021\] HCATrans 101](#)

Date heard: 21 May 2021 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Torts – Negligence – Causation – Where appellant worked in Serious Sex Offenders Unit (SSOU) of Office of Public Prosecutions (OPP) – Where work in SSOU required appellant to deal with confronting material of graphic sexual nature – Where, on 11 August 2011, appellant took sick leave for symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) but was not diagnosed and returned to work on 29 August 2011 – Where, on return, appellant was involved in dispute with manager and stated she did not wish to be rotated to different unit within OPP – Where, on 9 February 2012, appellant emailed manager requesting she be rotated out of SSOU due to effect of SSOU work on her health, but request was not actioned – Where primary judge held respondent

was put on notice as to risks to appellant's health in August 2011 – Where primary judge made inference that timely welfare enquiry by respondent would have revealed appellant's PTSD and, if appellant had been made aware of her condition, she would have consented to be rotated out of SSOU – Where primary judge held respondent failed to discharge duty of care in August 2011 by not making welfare enquiry and not rotating appellant out of SSOU – Where Court of Appeal overturned primary judge's inference that appellant would have consented to be rotated out and held that appellant's own actions in not consenting to be rotated out caused injury rather than respondent's actions – Where Court of Appeal did not address primary judge's finding that return to work after February 2012 caused appellant injury – Where Court of Appeal allowed respondent's appeal – Whether open to Court of Appeal to overturn primary judge's finding that if duty of care had been discharged in August 2011, appellant would have consented to be rotated out of SSOU – Whether Court of Appeal erred in failing to consider injury caused by return to work after February 2012.

Appealed from VSC (CA): [\[2020\] VSCA 301](#); (2020) 301 IR 446

Appealed from VSC (CA): [\[2020\] VSCA 316](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Tapp v Australian Bushmen's Campdraft & Rodeo Association Limited

S63/2021: [\[2021\] HCATrans 74](#)

Date heard: 16 April 2021 – *Special leave granted on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Torts – Negligence – Breach of duty – Obvious risk – Where appellant injured in competition conducted by respondent when horse she was riding slipped and fell – Where appellant contended cause of fall was deterioration in ground surface and respondent negligent in failing to plough ground at site of event, failing to stop competition, or failing to warn competitors when ground became unsafe – Where prior to appellant's participation, there had already been 7 falls – Where trial judge held no breach of duty of care established – Where majority of Court of Appeal held appellant failed to establish cause of fall was ground surface deterioration and therefore failed to establish respondent breached duty – Where majority of Court of Appeal held even if breach established, s 5L of *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW) applied to exclude respondent's liability as injury suffered was manifestation of "obvious risk" – Whether Court of Appeal's approach to evidence of ground surface deterioration did not afford appellant rehearing – Proper approach to identification of "obvious risk".

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2020\] NSWCA 263](#)

[Return to Top](#)

7: CASES NOT PROCEEDING OR VACATED

[Return to Top](#)

8: SPECIAL LEAVE REFUSED

Publication of Reasons: 17 June 2021 (Canberra)

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
1.	Groom	Police (A6/2021)	Supreme Court of South Australia (Court of Appeal) [2021] SASCA 1	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 102
2.	Smart	DAB16 & Ors (A11/2021)	Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCA 120	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 103
3.	Wreford	Lyle (P8/2021)	Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal) [2021] WASCA 20	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 104
4.	Akhtar	Gaber (S32/2021)	Full Court of the Family Court of Australia	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 105
5.	Singh	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (A23/2020)	Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCA 1725	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 106
6.	Millin	Vincent Rizzo Detective Senior Constable 40491 Moreland Crime Investigation Unit Victoria Police (C2/2021)	Application for Removal	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 107
7.	Kaur & Anor	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (M19/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCA 145	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 108
8.	Lietzau	Lietzau (P3/2021)	Full Court of the Family Court of Australia	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 109
9.	Island Resorts (Apartments) Pty Ltd	Gold Coast City Council (B15/2021)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2021] QCA 19	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 110

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
10.	Visser	The Queen (M10/2021)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2020] VSCA 327	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 111
11.	Visser	The Queen (M11/2021)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2020] VSCA 327	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 111
12.	Chang	Legal Profession Complaints Committee (P1/2021)	Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal) [2020] WASCA 208	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 112
13.	Order of AHEPA NSW Inc Pty Ltd	Lianos & Ors (S19/2021)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2020] NSWCA 304	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 113
14.	Leyonhjelm	Hanson-Young (S43/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCAFC 22	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 114
15.	Sayadi	The Queen (S229/2020)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Criminal Appeal) [2020] NSWCCA 28	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 115
16.	Li	The Queen (B74/2020)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2020] QCA 39	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 116
17.	Contempree	BS Investments Pty Ltd as Trustee for B&G Smith Investment Trust & Anor (B76/2020)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2020] QCA 255	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 117
18.	APH17	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (P4/2021)	Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCA 23	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 118
19.	FB	The Queen (S228/2020)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Criminal Appeal) [2020] NSWCCA 137	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 119

Publication of Reasons: 24 June 2021 (Canberra)

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
1.	Moore-McQuillan	Return to Work Corporation of South Australia (A1/2021)	Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia [2020] SASCFC 119	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 120
2.	Atkins	iiNet Pty Ltd (A7/2021)	Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia [2019] SASCFC 98	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 121
3.	Ogbonna	CTI Logistics Ltd & Anor (P7/2021)	Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal) [2021] WASCA 25	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 122
4.	Burgoyne	The Queen (A9/2021)	Supreme Court of South Australia [2021] SASCFC 9	Application dismissed [2021] HCASL 123
5.	Endresz	The Commonwealth of Australia (C3/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCAFC 18	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 124
6.	Bob Brown Foundation Inc.	Commonwealth of Australia & Ors (H4/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2021] FCAFC 5	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 125
7.	AC Holdings Co Pty Ltd & Anor	Super Vision Resources Ltd BVI Registered No 1810534 & Anor (S28/2021)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2020] NSWCA 319	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCASL 126

25 June 2021: Canberra and by video link

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Results</i>
1.	Gladstone Ports Corporation Limited	Murphy Operator Pty Ltd & Ors (B75/2020)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2020] QCA 250	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 114
2.	Heiko Constructions T/A Heiko Constructions Pty Ltd	Tyson (B78/2020)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCAFC 208	Matter discontinued
3.	7-Eleven Stores Pty Ltd	Davaria Pty Limited & Ors (M120/2020)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCAFC 183	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 113
4.	Australian Building and Construction Commissioner	Construction, Forestry, Maritime, Mining and Energy Union & Ors (M121/2020)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCAFC 192	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 115
5.	Flight Attendants' Association of Australia	Qantas Airways Limited & Anor (S3/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCAFC 227	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 116
6.	Transport Workers Union & Anor	Qantas Airways Limited & Anor (S4/2021)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2020] FCAFC 227	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 116
7.	HDI Global Specialty SE & Anor	Wonkana No 3 Pty Limited trading as Austin Tourist Park & Ors (S231/2020)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2020] NSWCA 296	Application dismissed with costs [2021] HCATrans 117