



HIGH COURT BULLETIN

Produced by the Legal Research Officer,
High Court of Australia Library
[2023] HCAB 3 (21 April 2023)

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	6
4: Original Jurisdiction	18
5: Section 40 Removal	19
6: Special Leave Granted	20
7: Cases Not Proceeding or Vacated	31
8: Special Leave Refused	32

1: SUMMARY OF NEW ENTRIES

2: Cases Handed Down

Case	Title
<i>Davis v Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Ors; DCM20 v Secretary of Department of Home Affairs & Anor</i>	Constitutional Law
<i>Kingdom of Spain v Infrastructure Services Luxembourg S.à.r.l. & Anor</i>	Public International Law

3: Cases Reserved

Case	Title
<i>Zurich Insurance Company Ltd & Anor v Koper & Anor</i>	Civil Procedure

<i>Hornsby Shire Council v Commonwealth of Australia & Anor</i>	Constitutional Law
<i>BDO v The Queen</i>	Criminal Law
<i>HCF v The Queen</i>	Criminal Law
<i>The King v Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd formerly known as Sinclair Knight Merz</i>	Criminal Law

4: Original Jurisdiction

Case	Title
<i>Jones v Commonwealth of Australia & Ors</i>	Constitutional Law

5: Section 40 Removal

Case	Title
<i>Benbrika v Minister for Home Affairs & Anor</i>	Constitutional Law

6: Special Leave Granted

Case	Title
<i>Potts & Anor v DSHE Holdings Ltd ACN 166 237 841 (receivers and managers appointed) (in liquidation) & Ors; Potts v National Australia Bank Limited (ABN 12 004 044 937)</i>	Corporations Law
<i>Hurt v The King; Delzotto v The King</i>	Criminal Law

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 April 2023 sittings.

Constitutional Law

Davis v Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Ors; DCM20 v Secretary of Department of Home Affairs & Anor

[M32/2022; S81/2022: \[2023\] HCA 10](#)

Date of judgment: 12 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law (Cth) – Executive power of the Commonwealth – Where s 351 of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) permitted Minister to personally exercise power to substitute more favourable decision for decision of tribunal – Where requests made for Minister to exercise power under s 351 – Where Minister issued instructions to departmental officers in purported exercise of executive power for general conduct of requests to substitute more favourable decision under s 351 ("Ministerial Instructions") – Where Ministerial Instructions required departmental officers to refer requests to Minister only where satisfied that "unique or exceptional circumstances" exist in respect of request – Whether Ministerial Instructions purported to instruct departmental officers to make decisions required to be exercised personally by Minister – Whether Ministerial Instructions exceeded limits of executive power as constrained by s 351 of Act.

Administrative law – Judicial review – Whether decisions in purported compliance with Ministerial Instructions exceeded limits of Commonwealth executive power.

High Court – Appellate jurisdiction – Whether Federal Court lacked jurisdiction to hear appeals by reason of s 476A(1) of Act – Consideration of character of purported decisions of departmental officers – Whether High Court accordingly deprived of jurisdiction to hear appeal.

Judgments and orders – Where appellants sought declarations as to departmental officers' legal error – Whether appellants had sufficient material interest to seek declaratory relief – Whether declaratory relief appropriate.

Words and phrases – "decision made personally", "declaratory relief", "evaluation of the public interest", "executive power of the Commonwealth", "guidelines", "Ministerial Instructions", "more favourable decision", "non-compellable power", "non-delegable power", "non-statutory action", "personal power", "procedural decision", "public interest", "repeat request", "statutory decision", "statutory limitation", "substantive decision", "unique or exceptional circumstances", "2009 Ministerial Instructions", "2016 Ministerial Instructions".

Constitution, ss 61, 64, 67, 73.

Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 (Cth), s 21.

Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth), ss 37, 39B.

Migration Act 1958 (Cth), ss 351, 474, 476A.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2021\] FCAFC 213](#); (2021) 288 FCR 23

Held: Appeals allowed with costs.

[Return to Top](#)

Public International Law

Kingdom of Spain v Infrastructure Services Luxembourg S.à.r.l. & Anor

S43/2022: [\[2023\] HCA 11](#)

Date of judgment: 12 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Public international law – Foreign State immunity – Immunity from jurisdiction – Proceedings for recognition and enforcement of arbitral award – Where respondents obtained arbitral award under Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (1965) ("ICSID Convention") – Where respondents sought to enforce award in Australia under s 35(4) of *International Arbitration Act 1974* (Cth) – Where s 9 of *Foreign States Immunities Act 1985* (Cth) ("Act") provides that a foreign State is immune from jurisdiction of Australian courts – Where appellant asserted foreign State immunity from jurisdiction – Whether appellant waived foreign State immunity from jurisdiction under s 10 of Act by submitting to jurisdiction by agreement – Whether entry into ICSID Convention and agreement to Arts 53, 54 and 55 constituted waiver of immunity from jurisdiction – Whether "recognition", "enforcement" and "execution" in Arts 53, 54 and 55

of ICSID Convention have separate and different meanings – Whether inconsistency arises between English, French and Spanish texts of ICSID Convention.

Words and phrases – "arbitral award", "enforcement", "execution", "exequatur", "explicature", "express", "foreign State immunity", "immunity from jurisdiction", "implicature", "implied", "inference", "international law principles", "recognition", "treaty interpretation", "waiver of immunity".

Foreign States Immunities Act 1985 (Cth), ss 9, 10.

International Arbitration Act 1974 (Cth), ss 2D, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, Sch 3.

Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (1965), Arts 53, 54, 55.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2021\] FCAFC 112](#); (2021) 392 ALR 443; (2021) 153 ACSR 59

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.

Civil Procedure

Zurich Insurance Company Ltd & Anor v Koper & Anor

S147/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 42](#)

Date heard: 13 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Civil procedure – Jurisdiction – Exercise of non-federal jurisdiction by State court – Service outside Australia – Service under *Trans-Tasman Pacific Act* 2010 (Cth) ("TTPA") – Where first respondent domiciled in New Zealand and registered proprietor of residential apartments designed and constructed by BMX NZ, entity incorporated in New Zealand, and without any assets or presence in Australia – Where BMX NZ insured by appellants under program of professional indemnity insurance – Where registered proprietors of apartments, commenced proceedings in High Court of New Zealand against BMX NZ and its principal, KNZ International Co Limited ("KNZ"), seeking damages in respect of various defects – Where damages awarded against BMX NZ and KNZ – Where, by summons filed on 1 April 2021 in Supreme Court of New South Wales, first respondent sought leave, pursuant to s 5 of *Civil Liability (Third Party Claims Against Insurers) Act* 2017 (NSW) ("*Claims Act*"), to bring representative proceedings under s 4 against first appellant – Where s 4 provides if insured person has insured liability to person, that person ("claimant") may recover amount of insured liability from insurer in proceedings before court of New South Wales – Where primary judge granted leave, holding *Claims Act* could not apply where claimant's claim against insured person could not properly have been brought in court of New South Wales, but, even though first respondent's claim against BMZ NZ was claim against New Zealand company, without Australian assets, arising out of tort committed in New Zealand, first respondent could bring claim in reliance on Pt 2 of TTPA – Where Pt 2 of TTPA applies to "civil proceeding commenced in Australian court" – Where, pursuant to s 9 of TTPA, initiating document issued by Australian court that relates to civil proceeding may be served in New Zealand under Pt 2 – Whether ss 9 and 10 of TTPA can validly operate to authorise, or to deem as effective, service of process of State court outside territory of Commonwealth except in matters that engage

federal jurisdiction – Whether first respondent could properly have brought claim against BMX NZ in connection with design or construction of apartments in court of New South Wales.

Constitutional law – Legislative power – Heads of power – External affairs – Service and execution of process throughout Commonwealth – Whether, having regard to terms of s 51(xxiv) and Ch III of *Constitution*, s 51(xxix) empowers Commonwealth Parliament to make laws with respect to service, outside Commonwealth, of process of State courts in matters that would not engage federal jurisdiction.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2022\] NSWCA 128](#); (2022) 368 FLR 420

[Return to Top](#)

Constitutional Law

Attorney-General (Cth) v Huynh & Ors

S78/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 190](#); [\[2022\] HCATrans 191](#)

Date heard: 8 and 9 November 2022

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Judicial power – Post-appeal application for inquiry into conviction – State courts – Supervisory jurisdiction – Where s 68(1) of *Judiciary Act 1903* (Cth) provided State laws with respect to procedures apply to persons charged with Commonwealth offences where jurisdiction conferred on courts of that State – Where s 68(2) conferred jurisdiction on State courts with respect to criminal proceedings – Where, following conviction for offences against laws of Commonwealth and unsuccessful appeal, appellant applied to NSW Supreme Court under Pt 7, Div 3 of *Crimes (Appeal and Review) Act 2001* (NSW) ("Appeal and Review Act") for review of conviction and sentence – Whether post-appeal inquiry and review procedures in Pt 7, Div 3 of Appeal and Review Act available in relation to conviction or sentence for Commonwealth offence heard in NSW court – Whether power exercised by judge under s 79 of Pt 7, Div 3 of Appeal and Review Act, to consider applications for inquiry into conviction made under s 78, judicial or administrative in nature – Whether ss 78-79 of Appeal and Review Act apply as federal law pursuant to s 68(1) of *Judiciary Act* in relation to conviction.

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2021\] NSWCA 297](#); (2021) 107 NSWLR 75; (2021) 396 ALR 422; (2021) 293 A Crim R 392

[Return to Top](#)

ENT19 v Minister for Home Affairs & Anor

S102/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 214](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 26](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 28](#)

Date heard: 8 December 2022; 14 and 15 March 2023

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Review of administrative decisions – Application for constitutional writs – Where plaintiff pleaded guilty to people smuggling and sentenced to imprisonment – Where, during sentencing, sentencing judge considered issue of general deterrence – Where plaintiff applied for Safe Haven Enterprise Visa ("SHEV") – Where Minister refused application for SHEV pursuant to s 65 of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth), not being satisfied grant of visa in "national interest", being criterion set out in cl 790.227 of Sch 2 of *Migration Regulations 1994* (Cth) ("Decision") – Whether Decision made for punitive purpose or inflicts punishment – Whether acting in "national interest" permits Executive to act for punitive purpose or in way amounting to punishment.

Administrative law – Jurisdictional error – Procedural fairness – Where Minister took account of media coverage of plaintiff's conviction as part of reason why grant of SHEV not in national interest – Whether Minister failed to consider relevant consideration – Whether Minister proceeded on incorrect understanding of law.

Application for constitutional or other writ referred to the Full Court on 5 September 2022.

[Return to Top](#)

Hornsby Shire Council v Commonwealth of Australia & Anor

S202/2021: [\[2023\] HCATrans 44](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 45](#)

Date heard: 18 and 19 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Taxation – Section 55 of *Constitution* – Laws imposing taxation only to deal with imposition of taxation – Where Commonwealth makes grants of financial assistance for local government purposes to States under s 9 of *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995* (Cth) – Where grants made on conditions specified in s 15 of *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act* – Where conditions in s 15 amended by items 16, 17 and 18 of Sch 1 to *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Amendment Act 2000* (Cth) to include conditions that, if local government failed to pay Commonwealth GST payments, then: (1) State required to withhold amount allocated to local government and pay amount to Commonwealth (s 15(aa)); and, if Commonwealth Minister tells State Treasurer that Commonwealth Minister satisfied State failed to withhold and pay amount, State to repay Commonwealth amount determined by Commonwealth Minister (s 15(c)) – Whether items 16, 17 or 18 of Sch 1 to *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Amendment Act* contrary to s 55 of *Constitution*.

Constitutional law – Taxation – Sections 114 of *Constitution* – Prohibition on Commonwealth taxes imposed on property of State – Where Commonwealth provides grants of financial assistance to States under *Federal Finance Relations Act 2009* (Cth), including revenue assistance by way of goods and services tax ("GST") – Where Commonwealth provides grants of financial assistance for local government purposes to States under *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act* – Where *Intergovernmental Agreement Implementation (GST) Act 2000* (NSW) introduced to give effect to agreement between Commonwealth and States regarding GST whereby Commonwealth paid States GST revenue and States assumed responsibility for payment of financial assistance to local governments – Where plaintiff purchased vehicle, with purchase amount including GST, and subsequently sold vehicle through auction with GST deducted – Where plaintiff, under protest, reported amount of notional GST relating to sale of vehicle in Business Activity Statement, being form for GST returns lodged with Australian Taxation Officer – Whether provisions of *Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act*, *Federal Financial Relations Act* and of *Intergovernmental Agreement Implementation (GST) Act* impose tax on property belonging to plaintiff, contrary to s 114 of *Constitution* – Proper approach to relief.

Special case referred to the Full Court on 5 September 2022.

[Return to Top](#)

Vanderstock & Anor v The State of Victoria

[M61/2021](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 7](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 10](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 11](#)

Date heard: 14, 15 and 16 February 2023

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Duties of excise – Section 90 of *Constitution* – Exclusive power of Commonwealth Parliament – Where *Zero and Low Emission Vehicle Distance-based Charge Act 2021* (Vic) ("ZLEV Act") defines "ZLEV" to mean any of following not excluded vehicles: (a) electric vehicle; (b) hydrogen vehicle; and (c) plug-in hybrid electric vehicle – Where s 7(1) of ZLEV Act requires registered operator of ZLEV to pay charge for use of ZLEV on specified roads – Whether s 7(1) of ZLEV Act invalid as imposing duty of excise within meaning of s 90 of *Constitution* – Whether ZLEV a tax on consumption of goods – Whether inland tax on consumption of goods a duty of excise within meaning of s 90 of *Constitution*.

Special case referred to the Full Court on 2 June 2022.

[Return to Top](#)

Vunilagi v The Queen & Anor

C13/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 3](#); [\[2023\] HCATrans 4](#)

Date heard: 8 and 9 February 2023

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

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Powers of courts – Powers of Legislative Assembly of Australian Capital Territory – Trial by jury – Where appellant arrested and committed to trial – Where, following COVID-19 outbreak, *Supreme Court Act 1933* (ACT) amended by *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020* (ACT) to include s 68BA which provided, relevantly, Court may order trial by judge alone – Where appellant advised Chief Justice proposed making order pursuant to s 68BA – Where appellant and first respondent opposed making of order – Where s 68BA repealed, but continued to apply to appellant by operation of s 116 and 117 of *Supreme Court Act* – Where Chief Justice ordered appellant's trial to proceed by judge alone – Where appellant found guilty – Whether s 68BA contravened limitation deriving from *Kable v Director of Public Prosecutions* (NSW) (1996) 198 CLR 511 – Whether s 68BA inconsistent with requirement in s 80 of *Constitution* that trial on indictment of any offence against law of Commonwealth be by jury.

Appealed from ACTSC (CA): [\[2021\] ACTCA 12](#); (2021) 17 ACTLR 72; (2021) 362 FLR 385; (2021) 295 A Crim R 168

[Return to Top](#)

Courts and Judges

QYFM v Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Anor

M53/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 217](#)

Date heard: 13 December 2022

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

Catchwords:

Courts and judges – Bias – Reasonable apprehension of bias – Disqualification – Where, prior to appointment, judge as Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions: (a) instituted and carried on successful prosecution of QYFM on indictment, and (b) appeared to successfully oppose appeal by QYFM against conviction – Where QYFM brought challenge to Minister's decision not to revoke cancellation of QYFM's visa – Where application for disqualification brought against judge on basis of apprehended bias – Where judge heard application alone, refused to disqualify himself and sat on Full Court appeal challenging primary judge's decision dismissing application for judicial review of Administrative Appeals Tribunal's decision to affirm cancellation of QYFM's visa – Whether application for disqualification of single member of Full Court on basis of apprehended bias should be decided by single judge alone or by Full Court – Whether judgment of Full Court liable to be set aside if single judge affected by apprehended bias.

Constitutional Law – Chapter III – Judicature of Commonwealth – Impartiality of judiciary – Bias – Reasonable apprehension of bias – Proper application of test in *Ebner v Official Trustee in Bankruptcy* (2000) 205 CLR 337.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2021\] FCAFC 166](#); (2021) 287 FCR 328

[Return to Top](#)

Criminal Law

BA v The King

[S101/2022: \[2023\] HCATrans 2](#)

Date heard: 7 February 2023

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

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Breaking and entering – Legal right to enter – Meaning of "breaks" – Where s 112 of *Crimes Act 1900* (NSW) provides person who breaks and enters any dwelling-house or other building and commits any serious indictable offence guilty of offence – Where appellant and complainant resided together in apartment occupied pursuant to residential tenancy where both named as lessees – Where relationship broke down and appellant moved out taking most of possessions – Where, when appellant remained co-tenant, appellant entered apartment by breaking down locked door and assaulted complainant – Where appellant charged with offence against s 112 of *Crimes Act* – Whether person with legal right to enter building capable of being guilty of breaking and entering building for purposes of s 112 of *Crimes Act* – Whether co-tenant can revoke second co-tenant's permission to enter leased dwelling-house with result that, despite enjoying right of entry under lease, second co-tenant may be guilty of breaking and entering – Whether permission of occupant without legal entitlement to occupy be determinative of whether person with legal right of immediate possession breaks into building for purposes of s 112 of *Crimes Act*.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2021\] NSWCCA 191](#); (2021) 105 NSWLR 307; (2021) 291 A Crim R 514

[Return to Top](#)

BDO v The Queen

[B52/2022: \[2023\] HCATrans 46](#)

Date heard: 20 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Criminal liability and capacity – *Doli incapax* – Where High Court in *RP v The Queen* (2016) 259 CLR 641 identified "knowledge of moral wrongness" as focus of *doli incapax* inquiry – Where s 29 of *Criminal Code* (Qld) provides age of majority – Whether statement of principles on *doli incapax* at common law articulated in *RP v The Queen* applies to s 29 of *Criminal Code* (Qld).

Criminal practice – Appeal – Miscarriage of justice – Application of proviso that no substantial miscarriage of justice actually occurred – *Criminal Code* (Qld), s 668E(1) – Where, at trial, trial judge proceeded on mistaken view that during entire period reflected on indictment, s 349(3) of *Criminal Code* deemed child under age of 12 unable to consent – Where s 349(3) did not come into force until mid-way through charge period – Where Court of Appeal held trial judge's direction erroneous insofar as any of appellant's acts took place prior to commencement of s 349(3) – Where Court of Appeal held no substantial miscarriage of justice occurred – Whether proviso applies where, by judicial error, Crown relieved of proving contested element of offence.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2021\] QCA 220](#)

[Return to Top](#)

HCF v The Queen

S148/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 43](#)

Date heard: 14 April 2023

Coram: Gageler, Edelman, Steward, Gleeson and Jagot JJ

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Miscarriage of justice – Juror misconduct – Application of proviso that no substantial miscarriage of justice actually occurred – *Criminal Code* (Qld), s 668E(1) – Where juror disobeyed trial judge's directions that: (1) prohibited independent research; and (2) required discovery by other jurors of any such misconduct – Where sheriff investigated juror misconduct pursuant to s 70(7) of *Jury Act 1995* (Qld) and produced report provided to parties before appeal heard – Whether substantial miscarriage of justice occasioned by proven disobedience by jurors of trial judge's direction – Whether verdicts of guilty were true for whole jury in circumstances where only five of twelve jurors responded to sheriff's investigation – Whether proviso applies where jury fails to obey judicial directions.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2021\] QCA 189](#)

[Return to Top](#)

The King v Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd formerly known as Sinclair Knight Merz

S148/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 41](#)

Date heard: 12 April 2023

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

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Sentencing – Penalty – Bribery of foreign official – Meaning of "benefit" – Where respondent pleaded guilty to offence of conspiring to cause offer of provision benefits to be made to other persons not legitimately due to those persons, with intention of influencing foreign public officials in order to obtain or retain business, contrary to ss 11.5 and 70.2 of *Criminal Code* – Where maximum penalty determined by s 70.2(5) and relevantly provides: offence punishable by fine not more than greatest of: (1) 100,000 penalty units; (2) where court can determine value of benefit body corporate obtained and that is reasonably attributable to conduct constituting offence—3 times value that benefit – Where "benefit" obtained by respondent certain project contracts – Whether maximum penalty under second limb of s 70.2(5) calculated on basis that value of benefit of contract is: (1) contract price; or (2) contract price less (untainted) costs to offender of performing it.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2022\] NSWCCA 152](#); (2022) 108 NSWLR 377; (2022) 367 FLR 365

[Return to Top](#)

Immigration

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

B42/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 23](#)

Date heard: 8 March 2023

Coram: Gageler, Gordon, Edelman, Steward and Jagot JJ

Catchwords:

Immigration – Visa cancellation decision under s 501(3A) of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) – Substantial criminal record – Where respondent's visa mandatorily cancelled following conviction for assaults occasioning bodily harm and for other offences, for which respondent sentenced to concurrent periods of imprisonment – Where respondent sought revocation of cancellation decision – Where Minister, in considering whether "another reason" why cancellation decision be revoked (s 501CA(4)(b)(ii)), took into account respondent's criminal history, including convictions which

Queensland Court ordered that there be "no conviction" – Where s 184(2) of *Youth Justice Act 1992* (QLD) ("YJA") provides, in relation to recording of convictions against child, finding of guilt without recording conviction *not* taken to be conviction for any purpose – Where s 85ZR(2) of *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth) ("CA") provides where, under State law person to be taken to never been convicted of offence under law of State, person shall be taken in corresponding circumstances or for corresponding purpose, by any Commonwealth authority, never to have been convicted of offence – Whether, on proper construction of s 184(2) of YJA, s 85ZR(2) of CA engaged – Whether Minister took into account irrelevant consideration.

Administrative law – Judicial review – Jurisdictional error – Irrelevant consideration – Materiality – Whether consideration of irrelevant consideration material.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 23](#); (2022) 288 FCR 10; (2022) 295 A Crim R 398

[Return to Top](#)

Leases and Tenancies

Young & Anor v Chief Executive Officer (Housing)

D5/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 30](#)

Date heard: 16 March 2023

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

Catchwords:

Leases and tenancies – Residential tenancies – Damages for distress and disappointment – Where Ms Young leased home from respondent – Where home without front door in doorframe for 68 months – Where appellants commenced proceedings in Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal ("Tribunal") seeking compensation under s 122(1) of *Residential Tenancies Act 1999* (NT) ("RTA") for breach of landlord's obligations to repair premises (s 57 of RTA), to provide reasonably secure home (s 49 RTA) or, alternatively, to ensure premises "habitable" (s 48 of RTA) – Where Tribunal found landlord failed to comply with obligation of repair (s 57) and awarded \$100 compensation – Where Supreme Court set aside Tribunal's decision, holding failure to install door fundamental breach of respondent's obligation to provide reasonably secure premises, and awarded \$10,200 compensation for resulting disappointment and distress for period of 68 months – Where Court of Appeal allowed appeal, determining only compensation for disappointment and distress resulting from physical inconvenience recoverable – Whether to

recover damages for emotional disturbance or "mental distress" claim brought under s 122 of RTA it necessary to apply principles of remoteness and foreseeability – Whether claim for compensation for emotional disturbance of "mental distress" able to be founded on breach of s 49.

Appealed from NT (CA): [\[2022\] NTCA 1](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Statutes

Disorganized Developments Pty Ltd & Ors v State of South Australia
[A22/2022](#): [\[2023\] HCATrans 25](#)

Date heard: 10 March 2023

Coram: Kiefel CJ, Gageler, Steward, Gleeson and Jagot JJ

Catchwords:

Statutes – Interpretation – Invalidity – Where s 83GD(1) in Pt 3B, Div 2 of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA)* ("CLCA") provides person who participant in criminal organisation and enters, or attempts to enter, "prescribed place" commits offence – Where s 83GA(1) defines "prescribed place" as place declared by regulation, but s 83GA(2) requires regulation under subsection (1) to "only relate to ... 1 place" – Where appellants became registered proprietors of land ("Cowirra Land") – Where Pt 3B, Div 2 of CLCA inserted by *Statutes Amendment (Serious and Organised Crime) Act 2015 (SA)* ("Amending Act") – Where s 13 of Amending Act provided *Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) Regulations 2015* ("CLCR") (set out in Sch 1) be regulations under CLCA – Where cl 3 of Sch 1 of Amending Act declared places to be prescribed places, but not Cowirra Land – Where Governor in Council subsequently made *Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) (Prescribed Place – Cowirra) Variation Regulations 2020* ("Cowirra (No.1) Regulations") and *Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) (Prescribed Place – Cowirra) (No 2) Variation Regulations 2020* ("Cowirra (No.2) Regulations") – Where Cowirra (No.1) Regulations and Cowirra (No.2) Regulations sought to vary r 3 of CLCR to add Cowirra Land as prescribed place – Whether r 3 of CLCR beyond power conferred by s 83GA(2) of CLCA – Whether Cowirra (No.1) Regulations and Cowirra (No.2) Regulations invalid because of absence of procedural fairness accorded – Whether, if Cowirra (No.1) Regulations and Cowirra (No.2) Regulations valid, s 83GD of CLCA applies to owner of land declared to be "prescribed place", director of corporation which is owner of land or any person authorised to access land.

Appealed from SASC (CA): [\[2022\] SASCA 6](#); (2022) 140 SASR 206; (2022) 295 A Crim R 351

[Return to Top](#)

Torts

CCIG Investments Pty Ltd v Schokman

B43/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 24](#)

Date heard: 9 March 2023

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

Catchwords:

Torts – Vicarious liability – Scope of employment – Opportunity or occasion for commission of tort – Where respondent asleep in appellant's staff accommodation when another employee urinated on face – Where trial judge concluded event exacerbated respondent's pre-existing conditions of narcolepsy and cataplexy, and suffered post-traumatic stress and adjustment disorder as result – Where respondent sued employer, alleging, relevantly, employee committed tort for which appellant, as employer, vicariously liable – Where primary judge found employee's act tortious, but concluded tort not committed in course of employee's employment – Where Court of Appeal applied *Prince Alfred College Inc v ADC* (2016) 258 CLR 134, holding employee occupying room as employee pursuant to obligations of employment contract and therefore requisite connection between employment and employee's actions – Whether event giving rise to respondent's injury within "course or scope of employment" – Proper approach to scope of vicarious liability discussed in *Prince Alfred College Inc v ADC*.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2022\] QCA 38](#); (2022) 10 QR 310

[Return to Top](#)

4: ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

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

Constitutional law

Jones v Commonwealth of Australia & Ors

[B47/2022](#)

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Powers of Commonwealth Parliament – Power to make laws with respect to naturalisation and aliens – Cessation of Australian citizenship – Where s 34(2) of *Australian Citizenship Act 2007* (Cth) ("2007 Citizenship Act") provides Minister for Home Affairs may revoke person's Australian citizenship where, relevantly, person has, after making application to become Australian citizen, been convicted of serious offence (s 34(2)(b)(ii)), and Minister satisfied that it contrary to public interest for person to remain Australian citizen – Where, by operation of transitional provisions, s 34(2)(b)(ii) applies as if it also referred to person's conviction, at any time after person made application for certificate Australian citizenship under *Australian Citizenship Act 1948* (Cth), of offence that person committed at any time before grant of certificate – Where plaintiff citizen of United Kingdom by birth and became Australian citizen in December 1988 – Where plaintiff convicted of offences contrary to Queensland laws – Where Minister revoked plaintiff's citizenship, relying on s 34(2)(b)(ii) of 2007 Citizenship Act – Whether s 34(2)(b)(ii) supported by s 51(xix) of *Constitution*.

Constitutional law (Cth) – Judicial power of Commonwealth – Whether s 34(2)(b)(ii) contrary to Ch III of *Constitution* – Whether s 34(2)(b)(ii) invalid for conferring upon Minister exclusively judicial function of adjudging and punishing criminal guilt.

Special case referred to the Full Court on 3 April 2023.

[Return to Top](#)

5: SECTION 40 REMOVAL

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

Constitutional Law

Benbrika v Minister for Home Affairs & Anor

M90/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 20](#)

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Judicial power of Commonwealth – Cessation of Australian citizenship – Where s 36D of *Australian Citizenship Act 2007* (Cth) provided Minister for Home Affairs may make determination that person ceases to be Australian citizen if satisfied, among other matters, that person convicted of specified offences in s 36D(5) and that it contrary to public interest for person to remain Australian citizen – Where applicant citizen of Algeria and Australia – Where applicant convicted of offences under ss 102.3(1) (intentionally being member of terrorist organisation), 102.2(1) (intentionally directing activities of terrorist organisation) and 101.4(1) (possession of thing connected with preparation for terrorist act) of *Criminal Code* (Cth) – Where provisions s 36D(5) that enlivened power to make determination under s 36D included offences against ss 102.3(1), 102.2(1) and 101.4(1) of *Criminal Code* – Where Minister determined, pursuant to s 36D(1), that applicant ceased to be Australian citizen – Whether s 36D contrary to Ch III of *Constitution* – Whether s 36D invalid for conferring upon Minister exclusively judicial function of adjudging and punishing criminal guilt.

Special case referred to Full Court on 23 February 2023.

[Return to Top](#)

6: SPECIAL LEAVE GRANTED

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

Civil Procedure

GLJ v The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Lismore

[S150/2022](#): [\[2022\] HCATrans 206](#)

Date heard: 18 November 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Civil procedure – Stay of proceedings – Fair trial – *Civil Procedure Act 2005* (NSW), s 67 Abuse of process – Where appellant claims to have been sexually assaulted by priest of Roman Catholic Diocese of Lismore – Where appellant instituted proceedings on 31 January 2020 against respondent, a statutory corporation, on bases of negligence and vicarious liability – Where priest died in 1996 – Where primary judge satisfied material showed that there likely to be evidence available allowing fair trial between parties – Where respondent sought permanent stay of proceedings – Where primary judge refused stay, but decision reversed by Court of Appeal – Where Court of Appeal considered fair trial could not be had in circumstances where priest unavailable to give factual instructions and respondent had not been notified of claims before priest's death – Whether proceedings ought to be stayed on basis that fair trial could no longer be had such that proceedings an abuse of process.

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2022\] NSWCA 78](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Constitutional Law

Crime and Corruption Commission v Carne

[B66/2022](#): [\[2022\] HCATrans 225](#)

Date heard: 15 December 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Constitutional law – Legislature – Privileges – Privilege of parliamentary debate and proceedings – Where Crime and Corruption

Commission ("Commission") received complaint as to allegations of corrupt conduct against respondent, former Public Trustee of Queensland – Where, following investigation, Commission prepared draft report, which did not make any finding of corrupt conduct – Where Commission submitted copy of Report to Chair of Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee ("PCCC") and requested, pursuant to s 69(1)(b) of *Crime and Corruption Act 2001* (Qld) ("CC Act"), that it be given to Speaker – Where respondent filed originating application seeking declaration that report was not "report" for purposes of s 69(1) of CC Act – Where Chair of PCCC issued evidentiary certificate under s 55 of *Parliament of Queensland Act 2001* (Qld) ("POQ Act") certifying report as: document prepared for purpose of, or incidental to, transacting business of PCCC under s 9(2)(c) of CC Act; and document present or submitted to PCCC – Where s 8(1) of POQ Act provides proceedings in Assembly cannot be impeached or questioned in any court – Whether parliamentary privilege protects reports prepared for and provided to parliamentary committees under POQ Act.

Statutes – Acts of Parliament – Interpretation – Where s 33 of CC Act provides for Commission's corruption functions – Where s 64 of CC Act provides Commission may report in performing its functions – Where s 69(1) provides report may be tabled in Parliament when report is made on a public hearing or report is directed to be given to Speaker – Where respondent contended that because report did not make finding of "corrupt conduct" and did not relate to public hearing, it was not report for purposes of s 69 of CC Act – Whether Commission only able to report about corruption investigation under CC Act where positive finding of "corrupt conduct".

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2022\] QCA 141](#); (2022) 405 ALR 166

[Return to Top](#)

Contract

Karpik v Carnival PLC ARBN 107 998 443 & Anor
S25/2023: [\[2023\] HCATrans 33](#)

Date heard: 17 March 2023 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Contract – Construction – Class action waiver clause – Exclusive jurisdiction clause – Where representative proceedings brought under Pt IVA of *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (Cth) ("FCA Act") against owner of cruise ship, *Ruby Princess* – Where class consisted of parties to either Australian terms and conditions, US terms and conditions or UK terms and conditions – Where US terms and

conditions contained class action waiver clause, exclusive jurisdiction clause, and choice of law clause – Where Federal Court asked to determine whether US terms and conditions incorporated into Mr Ho's contract and whether claim should in effect be stayed – Proper approach to construction of clauses.

Trade practices – Consumer law – Unfair terms – *Australian Consumer Law* ("ACL"), s 23 – Where primary judge held s 5(1)(g) of *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) extends operation of s 23 of ACL to "engaging in conduct outside Australia... by bodies corporate... carrying on business in Australia" – Whether extraterritorial scope of s 23 of ACL applied to Mr Ho's contract with second respondent – Whether class action waiver clause in Mr Ho's contract void or unenforceable under s 23 of ACL.

Private international law – Enforcement – Exclusive jurisdiction clause – Where US terms and conditions contained exclusive jurisdiction clause in favour of US courts – Whether Mr Ho's claim ought to be stayed pursuant to exclusive jurisdiction clause.

Representative proceedings – Class action – Waiver clause – Enforceability – Where primary judge and majority of Full Court held, because Pt IVA permissive, as group members can opt out under s 33J of FCA Act, parties are free to contractually waive right to participate in representative proceeding – Whether class action waiver clause in Mr Ho's contract void or unenforceable for being contrary to Pt IVA of FCA Act.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 149](#); (2022) 404 ALR 386; (2022) 163 ACSR 119

[Return to Top](#)

Copyright

Real Estate Tool Box Pty Ltd & Ors v Campaigntrack Pty Ltd & Anor
S137/2023: [\[2022\] HCATrans 13](#)

Date heard: 17 February 2023 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Copyright – Infringement – Authorisation – Where s 36(1) of *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth) provides copyright infringed by person who, not being owner of copyright, and without licence of owner, does in Australia, or "authorizes" doing in Australia of, any act comprised in copyright – Where s 36(1A) of *Copyright Act* sets out matters that must be taken into account in determining s 36(1) – Where Full Court found first, second, fifth and sixth applicants infringed copyright in

works by authorising infringements of second respondent and other developers in developing system, and by authorising infringements of users in using system – Where Full Court found third and fourth respondents infringed copyright in works by authorising infringements of second respondent – Proper approach to construction of "authorizes" in s 36(1) of *Copyright Act* – Whether finding of authorisation of infringement of copyright under s 36(1) of *Copyright Act* requires mental element – Whether authorisation under s 36(1) of *Copyright Act* may be imposed on persons by imputing to them indifference on account of failure to inquire about supposed infringement.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 112](#); (2022) 402 ALR 576; (2022) 167 IPR 411

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 121](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Corporations Law

Potts & Anor v DSHE Holdings Ltd ACN 166 237 841 (receivers and managers appointed) (in liquidation) & Ors; Potts v National Australia Bank Limited (ABN 12 004 044 937)
S133/2022; S134/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 48](#)

Date heard: 21 April 2023 – *Special leave granted* (S133/2022); *Special leave granted on limited grounds* (S134/2022)

Catchwords:

Corporations law – Compensation orders – Breach of directors' duties – Damage – Where directors found to have breached s 180 of *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) by voting in favour of payment of dividends – Where s 254T sets out circumstances in which dividend may be paid – Where s 1317H provides Court may order person to compensate corporation if person contravened corporation civil penalty provision and "damage resulted from contravention" – Whether payment by Dick Smith Holdings Ltd ("DSH") of dividend constitutes damage which resulted from contravention of s 180 within meaning of s 1317H – Whether, when assessing compensation under s 1317H for damage company suffered by contravention of s 180(1), Court must have regard to normative considerations in addition to considering "but for" causation – Whether, when assessing compensation under s 1317H for damage which company has suffered by contravention of s 180(1), dividend paid to shareholders is "damage" suffered by company within meaning of s 1317H where no breach of s 254T.

Corporations law – Proportionate liability – Where appellant Chief Financial Officer and director of DSH – Where National Australia Bank Ltd ("NAB") became DSH's financier after entering into Syndicated Facility Agreement ("SFA") – Where SFA contained representation as to accuracy of information provided by DSH to NAB – Where NAB relied on three causes of action for misleading conduct and appellant raised proportionate liability defences under ss 87CB of *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth), 1041L of *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth), and 12GP of *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001* (Cth), claiming DSH concurrent wrongdoer – Whether DSH concurrent wrongdoer – Whether, when determining if corporation, having regard to matters within its knowledge, engaged in misleading conduct by making representations in document authorised by board, issue should be determined solely by reference to matters within knowledge of board, rather than by reference to any knowledge attributable to corporation applying orthodox principles – Whether, when determining if corporation engaged in misleading conduct by making representations in document authorised by board, appropriate to exclude from consideration matters known to a particular member of board against whom allegations of misleading conduct been made, but not established.

Appealed from NSWSC (CA): [\[2022\] NSWCA 165](#); (2022) 405 ALR 70; (2022) 371 FLR 349; (2022) 163 ACSR 23

[Return to Top](#)

Criminal Law

Bromley v The King

A40/2021: [\[2022\] HCATrans 158](#)

Date heard: 16 September 2022 – *Special leave referred to Full Court for consideration as on appeal on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Second or subsequent appeal – Further evidence – Where applicant and co-accused convicted of murder – Where, at trial, prosecution led evidence from eyewitness who suffered from schizoaffective disorder – Where applicant and co-accused appealed against convictions, including on ground that eyewitness's evidence unsafe, but appeals dismissed and subsequent petitions for mercy refused – Where applicant sought to appeal pursuant to s 353A of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (SA) – Where s 353A empowers Full Court to hear second or subsequent appeal against conviction by person convicted on information if Court satisfied there "fresh and compelling evidence" that should, in "interests of justice", be considered on appeal – Where applicant adduced expert evidence

concerning reliability of eyewitness in light of mental illness – Where Court of Appeal refused application, holding new evidence not "fresh" or "compelling", and not in "interests of justice" to consider new evidence – Whether new evidence "compelling" – Whether in "interests of justice" to consider applicant's evidence.

Appealed from SASC (FC): [\[2018\] SASFC 41](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Hurt v The King; Delzotto v The King

C25/2022; C26/2022; S140/2022: [\[2023\] HCATrans 52](#)

Date heard: 21 April 2023 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Sentencing – Mandatory minimum sentences – Sentencing discretion – Where s 16AAB of *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth) imposes minimum sentences for certain offences – Whether minimum sentence to be regarded as base of range of appropriate sentence or minimum permissible sentence – Proper approach to minimum sentences – Whether proper approach involves sentencing judge having regard to minimum from outset as prescribing bottom of range of appropriate sentence, consistent with *Bahar v The Queen* (2011) 45 WAR 100 – Whether proper approach involves sentencing judge exercising sentencing discretion in usual way and only if proposed sentence falls below minimum penalty that minimum penalty has effect, consistent with approach in *R v Pot, Wetangky and Lande* (Supreme Court (NT), 18 January 2011, unrep).

Appealed from ACTSC (CA) (C25/2022; C26/2022): [\[2022\] ACTCA 49](#); (2022) 18 ACTLR 272

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2022\] NSWCCA 117](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Huxley v The Queen

B19/2023: [\[2023\] HCATrans 36](#)

Date heard: 17 March 2023 – *Special leave granted on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Jury direction – Witness evidence – Joint trial – Where appellant convicted by jury for murder after being charged on joint indictment which charged three others – Where direction given to jury in relation to witness' evidence – Where witness' evidence

central to co-accused's case and relevant to appellant's – Where direction made that jury should only act upon witness' evidence if satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that evidence truthful, reliable and accurate – Whether jury direction, that witness' evidence in joint trial can only be used by jury if satisfied evidence of witness truthful, reliable and accurate beyond reasonable doubt, constituted miscarriage of justice.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2021\] QCA 78](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Lang v The Queen

S143/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 201](#)

Date heard: 11 November 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Criminal law – Unreasonable verdict – Appeal against murder conviction – Where deceased died from knife wound to abdomen – Where hypothesis raised that deceased had committed suicide – Where pathologist expressed opinion that deceased's wound more likely to have been caused by second person than to have been self-inflicted – Whether guilty verdict unreasonable as, on whole of evidence, there reasonable possibility deceased committed suicide – Whether pathologist's opinion inadmissible because not an opinion based on expert knowledge – Lies – Consciousness of guilt – Whether alleged lie capable of overcoming improbabilities in Crown case.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2022\] QCA 29](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Evidence

McNamara v The King

S143/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 185](#)

Date heard: 21 October 2022 – *Special leave granted on limited grounds*

Catchwords:

Evidence – Unfair prejudice – Meaning of "party" – Joint trial – Co-accused – Where appellant and co-accused arraigned upon joint indictment that alleged one count of murder and one count of supply of commercial quantity of prohibited drug – Where Crown alleged that, pursuant to joint criminal enterprise, appellant and co-accused

murdered deceased and dispossessed deceased of drugs – Where appellant sought to introduce evidence relevant to defence of duress and existence of joint criminal enterprise, namely evidence co-accused said to appellant "I did [deceased]" and evidence co-accused told appellant of other serious crimes co-accused committed – Where evidence excluded on basis that, though relevant under s 55 of *Evidence Act 1994* (NSW), probative value of evidence substantially outweighed by danger evidence might be "unfairly prejudicial to party" under s 135(a) of *Evidence Act*, namely to co-accused – Whether word "party" in s 135(a) of *Evidence Act 1994* (NSW) extends to and includes co-accused in joint trial.

Appealed from NSWSC (CCA): [\[2021\] NSWCCA 160](#); (2021) 290 A Crim R 239

[Return to Top](#)

Immigration

AZC20 v Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Ors

M84/2022; M85/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 196](#)

Date heard: 11 November 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Immigration – Detention – Regional processing – Where appellant in immigration detention since 15 July 2013 – Where appellant required to be taken to regional processing country as soon as reasonably practicable under s 198AD of *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) – Where primary judge found it reasonably practicable to take appellant to regional processing country no later than end of September 2013 and, consequently, there had been "extensive" and "unwarranted delay" in removing appellant – Where primary judge made order compelling end of appellant's detention by causing appellant to be taken from Australia under s 196 of *Migration Act* ("mandamus order") – Where primary judge ordered appellant be detained in home only for so long as it took for appellant to be taken to regional processing country in accordance with mandamus order ("order 3") – Where order 3 suspended, coming into effect only if, after 14 days, respondents failed to take appellant to regional processing country – Where, hours before order 3 due to come into effect, only available regional processing country rejected appellant and Minister exercised personal, non-compellable power under s 198AE of *Migration Act* to disapply s 198AD to appellant – Where appellant remains in detention centre – Where Full Court granted leave to appeal from orders 3-5 of primary judge's orders – Whether order 3 satisfies temporal and/or purposive element of para (a) of definition of

"immigration detention" in s 5 of *Migration Act*, whereby immigration detention means being in company of, and restrained by, an officer or another prescribed person.

Constitutional law – Chapter III – Courts and judges – Appeal from interlocutory order – Where s 24(1A) of *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (Cth) requires leave to appeal from interlocutory judgment – Where ss 22 and 23 respectively confer power on Court to grant all remedies to which any party appears entitled and power to issue writs of such kinds as Court considers appropriate – Whether there "matter" within meaning of Chapter III of *Constitution* – Whether Full Court erred in granting leave to appeal from order 3 – Whether, in circumstances order 3 not come into execution, Full Court erred in granting leave without considering "substantial injustice" test.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 52](#); (2022) 290 FCR 149

[Return to Top](#)

Industrial Law

Qantas Airways Limited & Anor v Transport Workers Union of Australia

S153/2022: [\[2022\] HCATrans 205](#)

Date heard: 18 November 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Industrial law – Adverse action – Workplace right – Whether prohibition s 340(1)(b) only prohibits adverse action taken to prevent exercise of presently existing "workplace right" – Where first appellant made decision to outsource ground operations at 10 airports to third party providers – Where primary judge found outsourcing decision contravened s 340(1)(b) of *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) – Where, at time of outsourcing decision, one relevant enterprise agreement had not yet reached its nominal expiry date and no process of bargaining for replacement had been initiated, and another enterprise agreement had reached nominal expiry date and process of bargaining had commenced, but no process for protected industrial action been initiated – Where primary judge held first appellant contravened s 340(1)(b), finding first appellant had not discharged reverse onus under s 360(1) of establishing first appellant had not made outsourcing decision to prevent affected employees from exercising workplace rights to organise and engage in protected industrial action.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 71](#); (2022) 292 FCR 34; (2022) 402 ALR 1; (2022) 315 IR 1

[Return to Top](#)

Restitution

Redland City Council v Kozik & Ors

[B17/2023](#): [\[2023\] HCATrans 34](#)

Date heard: 17 March 2023 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Restitution – Unjust enrichment – Payment of public impost – Mistake of law – Restitutionary defence in public law – Where respondents plaintiffs in representative action against appellant seeking recovery of monies paid as ratepayers for charges wrongly levied by appellant – Where appellant accepts charges wrongly levied, but refuses to repay amount of charges expended for particular benefit of group of ratepayers – Where primary judge held appellant unable to raise restitutionary defences in circumstances where plaintiffs' claims brought as cause of action in debt and no contractual relationship arose – Where Court of Appeal majority found restitution claims available in circumstances where monies paid under invalid laws, but that ratepayers could not be considered to be unjustly enriched by repayment of monies – Whether defence of unjust enrichment available where payment of public impost made under mistake of law – Whether defence of unjust enrichment available where, though wrongly levied, charges expended to special benefit of group – Whether defence of unjust enrichment to be framed by reference to contractual principles of failure of consideration or by reference to material benefit derived.

Appealed from QLDSC (CA): [\[2022\] QCA 158](#); (2022) 252 LGERA 315

[Return to Top](#)

Statutes

Harvey & Ors v Minister for Primary Industry and Resources & Ors

[D9/2022](#): [\[2022\] HCATrans 229](#)

Date heard: 16 December 2022 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Statutes – Interpretation – *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth), s 24MD(6B)(b) – Meaning of "right to mine" – Meaning of

"infrastructure facility" – Where first respondent intended to grant mineral lease (ML 29881) to third respondent under s 40(1)(b)(ii) of *Mineral Titles Act 2010* (NT) – Where land subject to proposed lease would be used for construction of "dredge spoil emplacement area" to deposit dredged material from loading facility located on adjacent land subject to mineral lease already held by third respondent – Whether proposed grant of ML 29881 is future act within s 24MD(6B)(b) of *Native Title Act*, being creation of right to mine for sole purpose of construction of infrastructure facility associated with mining.

Appealed from FCA (FC): [\[2022\] FCAFC 66](#); (2022) 291 FCR 263; (2022) 401 ALR 578

[Return to Top](#)

Trade Practices

Mitsubishi Motors Australia Ltd & Anor v Begovic

M17/2023: [\[2023\] HCATrans 15](#)

Date heard: 17 February 2023 – *Special leave granted*

Catchwords:

Trade practices – Misleading or deceptive conduct – Where fuel consumption label affixed to new vehicle offered for sale – Where affixing of label required by *Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989* (Cth) and *Vehicle Standard (Australian Design Rule 81/02 – Fuel Consumption Labelling for Light Vehicles) 2008* ("Standard") – Where label displayed fuel consumption figures derived from standard testing of vehicle type – Where purchased vehicle unable to substantially achieve label figures under standard test – Where Court of Appeal held found label conveyed particular representation that fuel consumption figures substantially replicable in purchased vehicle ("testing replicability representation") – Where Court of Appeal found affixing of fuel consumption label to respondent's vehicle, and presenting and offering vehicle for sale with label affixed, appellants engaged in misleading or deceptive conduct in contravention of s 18 of *Australian Consumer Law* – Whether fuel consumption label made testing replicability representation – Whether conduct required by Standard can give rise to contravention of s 18 of *Australian Consumer Law*.

Appealed from VSC (CA): [\[2022\] VSCA 155](#); (2022) 403 ALR 558

[Return to Top](#)

7: CASES NOT PROCEEDING OR VACATED

[Return to Top](#)

8: SPECIAL LEAVE REFUSED

Publication of Reasons: 13 April 2023 (Canberra)

No.	Applicant	Respondent	Court appealed from	Result
1.	SJ Berry Pty Ltd & Anor	Mc Entee & Ors (A2/2023)	Supreme Court of South Australia (Court of Appeal) [2022] SASCA 133	Applications dismissed [2023] HCASL 38
2.	Nyoni	Bird (M5/2023)	Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1)	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 39
3.	Baker	Bond (M8/2023)	Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1)	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 40
4.	Sayed	National Disability Insurance Agency & Anor (M10/2023)	Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCA 1591	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 41
5.	Pro-Invest Australian Hospitality Opportunity (St) Pty Limited	Built QLD Pty Limited (B5/2023)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 266	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 42
6.	Sanchez	Commissioner of Police (B58/2022)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 212	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 43
7.	Sanchez	Commissioner of Police (B59/2022)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 212	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 43
8.	Vinaccia	The King (M74/2022)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2022] VSCA 107	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 44
9.	Chaouk	The King (M88/2022)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2022] VSCA 151	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 45
10.	Player	Avery (P34/2022)	Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal) [2022] WASCA 147	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 47
11.	E Group Security Pty Ltd	Chief Commissioner of State Revenue (S1/2023)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 259	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 48
12.	SunWater Limited	Liberty Mutual Insurance Company & Ors (S5/2023)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 273	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 49

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
13.	Atkinson	The King (B2/2023)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 252	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 50
14.	GBY18	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (C1/2023)	Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCA 1517	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 51
15.	Fierro	A Fierro & Ors (S7/2023)	Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1)	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 52
16.	JAI	The King (B65/2022)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 235	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 53
17.	McKenzie	Pugwall Pty Ltd & Anor (M3/2023)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2022] VSCA 272	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 54
18.	DCI16	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (M82/2022)	Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCA 1284	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 55
19.	Thorns	The State of Western Australia (P4/2023)	Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal) [2022] WASCA 127	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 56
20.	Harvard Nominees Pty Ltd	Nicoletti (P33/2022)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 179	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 57
21.	Hays	Department of Communities and Justice & Anor (S11/2023)	Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1)	Applications dismissed [2023] HCASL 58

Publication of Reasons: 20 April 2023 (Canberra)

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
1.	Smits	Cugola & Ors (B8/2023)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 262	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 59
2.	Quach	MLC Limited (C2/2023)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 202	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 60
3.	AWO21	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (C28/2022)	Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCA 1387	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 61
4.	Luck	Secretary of Services Australia & Ors (M6/2023)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 195	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 62
5.	Pain	The Queen (B64/2022)	Supreme Court of Queensland (Court of Appeal) [2022] QCA 233	Application dismissed [2023] HCASL 63
6.	Kwatra	Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs & Anor (M1/2023)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 194	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 64
7.	Golowka	Cotton On Group Services Pty Ltd (M2/2023)	Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal) [2022] VSCA 279	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 65
8.	Burton	Director of Public Prosecutions & Ors (S2/2023)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 242	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 66
9.	Hong	Gui (S3/2023)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 245	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 67
10.	Pascoe	SAS Trustee Corporation (S168/2022)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 244	Application dismissed with costs [2023] HCASL 69

21 April 2023: Canberra and by video link

<i>No.</i>	<i>Applicant</i>	<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Court appealed from</i>	<i>Result</i>
1.	Cooper	The King (D8/2022)	Court of Criminal Appeal of the Northern Territory [2022] NTCCA 16	Application refused [2023] HCATrans 47
2.	Mawhinney	Australian Securities & Investments Commission & Ors (M69/2022)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 159	Application refused [2023] HCATrans 50
3.	Mayfair Wealth Partners Pty Ltd & Ors	Australian Securities and Investments Commission & Anor (M77/2022)	Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia [2022] FCAFC 170	Application refused with costs [2023] HCATrans 51
4.	HSBC Bank Australia Limited ABN 48006434162	Abboud & Anor (S135/2022)	Supreme Court of New South Wales (Court of Appeal) [2022] NSWCA 165	Application refused with costs [2023] HCATrans 49