

Australian Capital Territory Reports

Argos Pty Ltd v Corbell, Minister for the Environment and Sustainable Development (ACTSC
— Burns J) (2012) **178.22**

Foote v Dixon (ACTCA — Full Court) (2013) **178.17**

R v Muller (ACTCA — Full Court) (2013) **178.1**

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

- Alcan (NT) Alumina Pty Ltd v Commissioner of Territory Revenue (2009) 239 CLR 27; 260 ALR 1; [2009] HCA 41, considered 303.644
- Assistant Commissioner Condon v Pompano Pty Ltd (2013) 295 ALR 638; 87 ALJR 458; [2013] HCA 7, considered 303.644
- Austral Pacific Group Ltd (in liq) v Airservices Australia (2000) 203 CLR 136; 173 ALR 619; [2000] HCA 39, applied 303.583
- Australian Foreman Stevedors Association v Crone (1989) 20 FCR 377; 98 ALR 276; 17 ALD 165, applied 178.22*
- Baker v R (2004) 223 CLR 513; 210 ALR 1; [2004] HCA 45, considered 303.644
- Batistatos v Roads and Traffic Authority of New South Wales (2006) 226 CLR 256; 227 ALR 425; 45 MVR 288; [2006] HCA 27, considered 303.644
- Bell v Police [2010] SASC 188, applied 166.12**
- Belna Pty Ltd v Irwin [2009] NSWCA 46, applied 303.583
- Bolton, Re; Ex parte Beane (1987) 162 CLR 514; 70 ALR 225, considered 303.644
- Burch v South Australia (1998) 71 SASR 12, considered 303.644
- Catlow v Accident Compensation Commission (1989) 167 CLR 543; 87 ALR 663, considered 303.644
- Chief Executive Officer of Customs v Labrador Liquor Wholesale Pty Ltd (2003) 216 CLR 161; 201 ALR 1; [2003] HCA 49, considered 166.12**
- CIC Insurance Ltd v Bankstown Football Club Ltd (1997) 187 CLR 384; 141 ALR 618, considered 303.644
- CSL Australia Pty Ltd v Formosa (2009) 261 ALR 441; [2009] NSWCA 363, applied 303.583
- Dickfoss v Director of Public Prosecutions (2012) 31 NTLR 16; 165 NTR 12; [2012] NTCA 1, applied 166.12**; considered 303.644
- Director of Public Prosecutions v George (2008) 102 SASR 246; 251 ALR 658; [2008] SASC 330, applied 166.12**; considered 303.644
- Doubleday v Kelly [2005] NSWCA 151, applied 303.583
- Elias v R; Issa v R (2013) 298 ALR 637; 87 ALJR 895; [2013] HCA 31, considered 303.644
- Emmerson v Director of Public Prosecutions (2013) 33 NTLR 1; [2013] NTCA 4, considered 303.644
- Fardon v Attorney-General (Qld) (2004) 223 CLR 575; 210 ALR 50; [2004] HCA 46, considered 166.12**, 303.644
- Fingleton v Christian Ivanoff Pty Ltd (1976) 14 SASR 530, distinguished 166.1**
- Forbes (Collector of Customs, NSW) v Tranders Finance Corporation Ltd (1971) 126 CLR 429; [1972] ALR 653, considered 303.644
- Gypsy Jokers Motorcycle Club Inc v Commissioner of Police (2008) 234 CLR 532; 242 ALR 191; [2008] HCA 4, considered 303.644
- HA Bachrach Pty Ltd v Queensland (1998) 195 CLR 547; 156 ALR 563; [1998] HCA 45, considered 303.644
- Hallett v Cottam [2007] WASC 147, distinguished 303.621; overruled 303.621
- Harris v Cooke (1918) 88 LJKB 253, considered 303.644
- Hoare v R (1989) 167 CLR 348; 86 ALR 361, considered 303.644
- Insight Vacations Pty Ltd v Young (2011) 243 CLR 149; 276 ALR 497; [2011] HCA 16, applied 303.583
- International Finance Trust Co Ltd v New South Wales Crime Commission (2009) 240 CLR 319; 261 ALR 220; [2009] HCA 49, considered 166.12**, 303.644
- Jacob v Utah Construction and Engineering Pty Ltd (1966) 116 CLR 200; [1967] ALR 255, considered 303.644
- Kable v Director of Public Prosecutions (NSW) (1996) 189 CLR 51; 138 ALR 577, considered 166.12**; discussed 303.644

(Continues on p vi of cover)

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART — *continued*

- K-Generation Pty Ltd v Liquor Licensing Court (2009) 237 CLR 501; 252 ALR 471; [2009] HCA 4, considered 303.644
- Kirk v Industrial Court (NSW) (2010) 239 CLR 531; 262 ALR 569; 113 ALD 1; [2010] HCA 1, considered 303.644
- Leach v R (2007) 230 CLR 1; 232 ALR 325; [2007] HCA 3, considered 303.644
- Lloyd v Snooks (1999) 9 Tas R 41; [1999] TASSC 117, considered 303.644
- McNicholl v Tothill (1988) 47 SASR 134; 6 MVR 449, considered 303.644
- Murphy v Farmer (1988) 165 CLR 19; 79 ALR 1, considered 303.644
- Mutual Life & Citizens' Assurance Co Ltd v Evatt (1968) 122 CLR 556; [1969] ALR 3, considered 303.644
- Nicholas v R (1998) 193 CLR 173; 151 ALR 312; [1998] HCA 9, considered 303.644
- Owen v South Australia (1996) 66 SASR 251, considered 303.644
- Palling v Corfield (1970) 123 CLR 52; [1971] ALR 275, applied 303.644
- Police v Cadd (1997) 69 SASR 150; 26 MVR 380, considered 303.644
- v S [1997] SASC 6227, considered 303.644
- Public Service Association of SA Inc v Industrial Court (SA) (2011) 109 SASR 223; [2011] SASCFC 14, considered 303.644
- R v Smithers; Ex parte McMillan (1982) 152 CLR 477; 44 ALR 53, applied 166.12**
- v Cavit; Ex parte Rosenfield (1985) 33 NTR 29, distinguished 166.1**
- v Ironside (2009) 104 SASR 54; 256 ALR 533; [2009] SASC 151, considered 303.644
- v Place (2002) 81 SASR 395; 189 ALR 431; [2002] SASC 101, considered 303.644
- Reid v Howard (1995) 184 CLR 1; 131 ALR 609; [1995] HCA 40, considered 303.621
- S (an infant) v Recorder of Manchester [1971] AC 481; [1969] 3 All ER 1230, considered 303.644
- SAEED v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship (2010) 241 CLR 252; 267 ALR 204; 115 ALD 493; [2010] HCA 23, considered 303.644
- Secretary, Department of Health and Community Services v JWB (1992) 175 CLR 218; 106 ALR 385; 15 Fam LR 392; [1992] HCA 15, considered 303.621
- SH v R (2012) 83 NSWLR 258; [2012] NSWCCA 79, applied 178.1*
- South Australia v Totani (2010) 242 CLR 1; 271 ALR 662; [2010] HCA 39, applied 166.12**;
discussed 303.644
- Wainohu v New South Wales (2011) 243 CLR 181; 278 ALR 1; [2011] HCA 24, considered 303.644
- Waugh v Kippen (1986) 160 CLR 156; 64 ALR 195, considered 303.644
- Western Export Services Inc v Jireh International Pty Ltd (2011) 282 ALR 604; 86 ALJR 1; [2011] HCA 45, considered 303.644
- Whan v McConaghy (1984) 153 CLR 631; 52 ALR 449; [1984] HCA 22, considered 303.621
- Wynbyne v Marshall (1997) 7 NTLR 97; 117 NTR 11, considered 303.644

STATUTES, RULES ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH CONSTITUTION		s 119	178.22*
Commonwealth Constitution		s 120	178.22*
s 76	303.583	s 121	178.22*
COMMONWEALTH		s 139	178.22*
Australian Capital Territory (Planning and		s 152	178.22*
Land Management) Act 1988		s 153	178.22*
s 6	178.22*	s 155	178.22*
s 9	178.22*	s 160	178.22*
s 10	178.22*	s 162	178.22*
s 11	178.22*	NORTHERN TERRITORY	
s 25	178.22*	Criminal Property Forfeiture Act 2002	
s 26	178.22*	s 10	166.12**
Judiciary Act 1903		s 52	166.12**
s 39	303.583	s 94	166.12**
s 79	303.583	Misuse of Drugs Act 1990	
s 80	303.583	s 36A	166.12**
Trade Practices Act 1974		NEW SOUTH WALES	
s 68	303.583	Civil Liability Act 2002	
s 68B	303.583	s 5	303.583
s 74	303.583	s 5A	303.583
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY		s 5B	303.583
Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review)		s 5C	303.583
Act 1989		s 5I	303.583
s 3B	178.22*	s 5J	303.583
s 5	178.22*	s 5K	303.583
s 6	178.22*	s 5L	303.583
Evidence Act 2011		s 5M	303.583
s 13	178.1*	s 5R	303.583
s 21	178.1*	s 5S	303.583
s 137	178.1*	s 16	303.583
s 165	178.1*	Interpretation Act 1987	
s 165A	178.1*	s 33	303.583
Planning and Development Act 2007		Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act	
s 28	178.22*	1965	
s 29	178.22*	s 8	303.583
s 30	178.22*	s 9	303.583
s 48	178.22*	SOUTH AUSTRALIA	
s 50	178.22*	Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and	
s 51	178.22*	Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007	
s 53	178.22*	s 12(1)(a)(iii)	303.644
s 54	178.22*		

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Judicial review — Standing — Minister approved development application to permit a commercial development — Whether plaintiffs were persons aggrieved — Whether minister had jurisdiction to approve the development application — Whether minister took into account all relevant considerations — Whether minister breached rules of natural justice: *Argos Pty Ltd v Corbell, Minister for the Environment and Sustainable Development* 178 ACTR 22

Natural justice — Bias — Apprehended bias — Husband of magistrate employed as Principal Legal Officer of the Central Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service — Prosecution sought declaration that magistrate excuse herself from any judicial matter involving individuals represented by lawyers employed by Central Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service on the basis of apprehended bias — Whether a fair minded lay-observer would reasonably apprehend bias on the part of the magistrate: *Attorney-General (NT) v Director of Public Prosecutions* 166 NTR 1

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Judicial power — Institutional integrity of state courts — State legislation required Supreme Court to make declaration that person nominated in application by Director of Public Prosecutions was a “drug trafficker” upon satisfaction of prescribed criteria — Consequence of declaration that all of nominated person’s property was forfeited to Northern Territory — Court required to make declaration that person is a “drug trafficker” contrary to evidence — Legislation invalid: *Emmerson v Director of Public Prosecutions* 166 NTR 12

COURTS AND JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Appeal — New trial — In general and particular grounds — Appeal settled by consent — Consent orders lodged including orders upholding appeal and ordering new trial — Whether consent orders should be entered — Whether parties needed to show arguable appealable error — Respondent disputed arguable appealable error — Whether court should order new trial without hearing appeal — Whether court should order new trial given advice from parties that new trial would not in fact take place — Whether parties’ seeking order for new trial amounted to forum-shopping or an abuse of the court’s role: *Foote v Dixon* 178 ACTR 17

Jurisdiction — Federal jurisdiction — Identification of character of jurisdiction — Whether state law picked up and applied as surrogate federal law: *Motorcycling Events Group Australia Pty Ltd v Kelly* 303 ALR 583

Jurisdiction — Inherent jurisdiction of the court — An order that a person submit to a mouth swab to provide a sample for DNA analysis to determine the issue of paternity — Court did not have the inherent jurisdiction to make the order: *Furesh (as administrator of the intestate estate of Slipceovich) v Schor* 303 ALR 621

EVIDENCE

Competence — Lack of capacity — Unsworn evidence — Potential witness incapable of understanding his or her obligation to give truthful evidence — Incapacity of understanding irrelevant to competence to give unsworn evidence: *R v Muller* 178 ACTR 1

NEGLIGENCE

Recreational activities — Dangerous recreational activities — Motorcycling riding — Tuition — Where different skill levels of motorcycle riders on track at same time — Risk warning — Oral instructions — Breach — Risk not insignificant — Injury likely to be serious — Burden of taking precautions — Alternative system of arranging riders — Causation — Contributory negligence — Appellate review of apportionment decisions — Damages for non-economic loss: *Motorcycling Events Group Australia Pty Ltd v Kelly* 303 ALR 583

STATUTES

Acts of Parliament — Motor vehicle forfeiture — Whether legislation permitted the making of an application for forfeiture after the finalisation of the conviction proceedings for the offence in respect of which the application for forfeiture is made — Whether legislation was invalid to the extent that it relied upon the court to perform a function that was inconsistent or incompatible with its defining characteristics as a court — Whether defendant’s conviction was properly to be regarded as one of the three prescribed offences: *Attorney-General (SA) v Bell* 303 ALR 644

Interpretation — Literal or ordinary meaning — No ambiguity or lack of clarity — Context — Legislative history: *Motorcycling Events Group Australia Pty Ltd v Kelly* 303 ALR 583

(Continues on p xii of cover)

INDEX — *continued*

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Trade practices — Contract for services — Services to be rendered with due care and skill —
Exclusion clause — Whether void — Where exclusion clause purported to cover death,
personal injury and property damage: *Motorcycling Events Group Australia Pty Ltd v
Kelly* 303 ALR 583

WORDS AND PHRASES

“competence”: *R v Muller* 178 ACTR 1

“decisional independence”: *Emmerson v Director of Public Prosecutions* 166 NTR 12

“drug trafficker”: *Emmerson v Director of Public Prosecutions* 166 NTR 12

“unsworn evidence”: *R v Muller* 178 ACTR 1