

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Australian Corporations and Securities Reports

<u>Alumina and Bauxite Company Ltd v Queensland Alumina Ltd</u> (FCA — O’Bryan J) (2024) 171.556
Australian Securities and Investments Commission v National Australia Bank Ltd (ACN 004 044 937) (No 2) (FCA — Derrington J) (2023) 171.176
Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Select AFSL Pty Ltd (ACN 151 931 618) (No 3) (FCA — Abraham J) (2023) 171.331
Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Wilson (No 3) (FCA — Jackson J) (2023) 171.1
Clean Energy Regulator v E Connect Solar Electrical Pty Ltd (ACN 625 797 337) (FCA — Derrington J) (2023) 171.216
Crowley v Worley Ltd (ACN 096 090 158) (No 2) (FCA — Jackman J) (2023) 171.410
Re Chesser Resources Ltd (ACN 118 619 042) (FCA — Feutrill J) (2023) 171.316
Re DDH1 Ltd (ACN 636 677 088) (FCA — Colvin J) (2023) 171.523
Sharif v Vitruvian Investments Pty Ltd (ACN 630 548 846) (No 3) (FCA — Colvin J) (2023) 171.256
Vitruvian Investments Pty Ltd (ACN 630 548 846) v Sharif (FCA — Colvin J) (2023) 171.256
<u>Walker v Members Equity Pty Ltd (formerly Members Equity Bank Ltd)</u> (FCA — Bromwich J) (2024) 171.539

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

Australian Building and Construction Commissioner v Pattinson (2022) 274 CLR 450; 399 ALR 599; 175 ALD 383; [2022] HCA 13, considered 171.539

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Reckitt Benckiser (Australia) Pty Ltd (2016) 340 ALR 25; [2016] FCAFC 181, applied 171.539

Australian Securities and Investments Commission v BT Funds Management Ltd [2021] FCA 844, applied 171.539

Barbaro v R (2014) 253 CLR 58; 305 ALR 323; [2014] HCA 2, applied 171.539

Director of Public Prosecutions (Cth) v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd (2019) 137 ACSR 575; [2019] FCA 1170, applied 171.539

Environment Protection Authority v Truegrain Pty Ltd (2013) 85 NSWLR 125; [2013] NSWCCA 204, applied 171.539

Mill v R (1988) 166 CLR 59; 83 ALR 1, applied 171.539

R v Glynatsis [2013] NSWCCA 131, applied 171.539

Singtel Optus Pty Ltd v Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (2012) 287 ALR 249; [2012] FCAFC 20, applied 171.539

STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH	
Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001	
s 12GB	171.539
Autonomous Sanctions Act 2011	
s 4	171.556
s 16	171.556
Autonomous Sanctions Regulations 2011	
reg 3	171.556
reg 4	171.556
reg 6	171.556
reg 12	171.556
	reg 13
	reg 14
	reg 15
	reg 18
	Crimes Act 1914
	s 16
	s 16A
	National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009
	Sch 1 s 64
	Sch 1 s 65

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

CONTRACT

Foreign companies — Applicants were subsidiaries of company registered in Russian Federation — Where first respondent, Queensland Alumina Ltd (QAL), operates alumina refinery in Gladstone under agreements with applicants and second to sixth respondents (Rio parties) — Where pursuant to those agreements Rio parties supply bauxite to first applicant, Alumina and Bauxite Company Ltd (ABC), and ship bauxite to Gladstone on behalf of ABC, and QAL receives bauxite and refines bauxite into alumina on toll basis on behalf of ABC and certain of Rio parties and delivers alumina to those parties — Where Australian Government imposed sanctions against Russia and certain Russian business-people pursuant to Autonomous Sanctions Regulations 2011 (Cth) (Russia Sanctions) as result of Russia's invasion of Ukraine — Where QAL invoked provisions of agreements to cease receiving bauxite and producing alumina for ABC and delivering alumina to ABC — Where Rio parties invoked provisions of agreements and ceased supplying and shipping bauxite to ABC — Whether actions of QAL and Rio parties are in breach of contracts with applicants — Whether imposition of Russia Sanctions rendered performance of contracts by QAL illegal and was therefore supervening illegality to excuse performance — Whether imposition of Russia Sanctions was event of force majeure for purposes of contractual provision to excuse performance: *Alumina and Bauxite Company Ltd v Queensland Alumina Ltd* 171 ACSR 556

CRIMINAL LAW

Sentencing — Defendant pled guilty to summary criminal offences — Determination of appropriate penalties: *Walker v Members Equity Pty Ltd (formerly Members Equity Bank Ltd)* 171 ACSR 539

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Undertakings — Whether undertaking to court proffered by applicants in respect of their future conduct should be accepted — Whether declaratory and injunctive relief should be granted on basis of undertaking as to future conduct — Whether compliance with undertaking removed risk of contravention of Russia Sanctions: *Alumina and Bauxite Company Ltd v Queensland Alumina Ltd* 171 ACSR 556

STATUTORY INTERPRETATION

Statutes — Whether delivery of alumina by QAL to ABC was “sanctioned supply” within meaning of regs 4 and 12 of Russia Sanctions — Consideration of phrases “for use in” and “for benefit of” — Whether production of alumina by QAL for ABC and delivery of alumina by QAL to ABC involves indirectly making asset available to, or for benefit of, designated person or entity within meaning of reg 14 of Russia Sanctions — Where designated persons have substantial indirect shareholding interests in ABC — Consideration of phrase “indirectly makes asset available” and “for benefit”: *Alumina and Bauxite Company Ltd v Queensland Alumina Ltd* 171 ACSR 556