

Conveyancing Service

New South Wales
CURRENT BPR AND CASENOTES

Service BPR 295

March 2025

Authors

E Peden Judge, Supreme Court of NSW

C J Rossiter BA LLB (Syd) PhD (NSW)

G A Moore BA LLM

J K Carter LLB (Hons) BIntBus (Griffith) BBusSt (Monash) LLM (CUHK)

K M Jamieson-Kell BA LLB

D A Pitavino BA (Hons) LLB (Hons) (Syd) GDLP (COL)

In this Service:

[99021] *Hartnett (t/as Hartnett Lawyers) v Bell (as executor of the estate of the late Deakin-Bell)*

Mortgages and guarantees — Mortgages — Mortgagees' costs — Clause in mortgage instrument permitting mortgagee to recover legal costs incurred in reference to security to be paid by mortgagor — Solicitor acted for mortgagee in undefended possession proceedings — Solicitor for mortgagee engaged in exorbitant overcharging of mortgagee — Property was sold pursuant to possession orders — Solicitor paid himself exorbitant legal fees from proceeds of sale — Mortgagor sought to be relieved from payment of mortgagee's solicitor's exorbitant legal fees — Proper

PageCHECK ✓

Do you think your copy of this publication has **missing or misfiled pages**? Find out now using **PageCHECK** at www.lexisnexis.com.au. You can order missing or replacement pages directly from this site. **PageCHECK** lists page numbers and according service numbers for **all** LexisNexis looseleaf services. Listings are arranged by volume and guidecard for easy access.



© LexisNexis 2025
LexisNexis Distribution Centre
138 Bonds Road Riverwood NSW 2210

LexisNexis Head Office
Tel 1800 772 772 Fax (02) 9422 2444

On the Internet at www.lexisnexis.com.au
Print Post Approved PP 255003/00722

approach to inherent supervisory and disciplinary jurisdiction of Supreme Court over solicitors with respect to charging of clients — Proper exercise of jurisdiction to require solicitor to pay amount to mortgagor — (NSW) Legal Profession Uniform Law 2014 s 264 — (NSW) Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014 Sch 2 cl 6.1 — (NSW) Supreme Court Act 1970 s 23 — (QLD) Legal Profession Act 2007 ss 300, 308, 313, 315, 316, 317, 323, 324, 335

[99021] *Hartnett (t/as Hartnett Lawyers) v Bell (as executor of the estate of the late Deakin-Bell)*

Words and phrases — “inherent jurisdiction” — “disciplinary jurisdiction” — “supervisory jurisdiction” — “exorbitant overcharging”

[99022] *Kramer v Stone*

Equity — Proprietary estoppel — Estoppel by encouragement — Knowledge of detriment — Where deceased promised to leave property to sharefarmer who had worked on property for approximately 40 years — Where deceased’s Will did not do so — Where sharefarmer continued to share farm on property in reliance on representation Whether deceased needed to have actual knowledge of detrimental reliance on representation for estoppel to be established

[99022] *Kramer v Stone*

Procedure — Appeals — Further evidence — Evidence adduced at subsequent hearing before final orders made — Whether such evidence “further evidence” for purposes of s 75A of Supreme Court Act 1970 (NSW) — Whether appellant should be permitted to rely on such evidence following first hearing to impugn findings made after first hearing

[99023] *Property Holdings Group Pty Ltd v Rosehill Panorama Pty Ltd (in its capacity as trustee of the Rosehill Panorama Unit Trust)*

Mortgages and securities — Real securities — Charges Equitable charges — Creation of equitable charges by agreement — Where parties execute deed terms of which entitle plaintiff to payment of fee by first defendant upon occurrence of certain event — Where event in question consists of receipt of development consent as defined in deed to residential and commercial development scheme — Where first defendant covenants to lodge and pursue development application as defined in deed and to take all necessary steps to obtain development consent as defined — Where parties agree that pending payment of fee plaintiff shall be entitled to charge upon extant options or contracts to purchase properties comprising development scheme or properties themselves — Where first defendant covenants not to deal with such options or contracts or properties pending payment of fee — Where first defendant breaches covenant by submitting alternative development scheme discordant with terms of deed — Where no development consent as defined received prior to first defendant’s entry into administration — Where preconditions to plaintiff’s entitlement to payment of fee remain unsatisfied — Whether plaintiff holds charge over properties comprising development scheme pending payment of fee — Whether clause purporting to charge such properties amounts to agreement to grant charge in future

[99023] *Property Holdings Group Pty Ltd v Rosehill Panorama Pty Ltd (in its capacity as trustee of the Rosehill Panorama Unit Trust)*

Equity — Maxims — Equity regards as done that which ought to be done — Where precondition to plaintiff’s entitlement to payment of fee by first

In this Service — continued

defendant unsatisfied by reason of first defendant's breaches of covenant — Where plaintiff asserts entitlement to payment of fee by application of maxim that equity regards as done that which ought to be done — Where that which plaintiff contends ought to be done consists of first defendant's performance of contractual preconditions to payment of fee — Whether plaintiff entitled to circumvent such preconditions by application of maxim [99023] *Property Holdings Group Pty Ltd v Rosehill Panorama Pty Ltd (in its capacity as trustee of the Rosehill Panorama Unit Trust)*
Equity — Maxims — Party is not entitled to take advantage of its own wrong — Where plaintiff asserts entitlement to payment of fee by application of maxim that party is not entitled to take advantage of its own wrong — Where wrong in question consists of first defendant's breaches of covenant disentitling plaintiff to payment of fee — Whether plaintiff entitled to circumvent preconditions to payment by application of maxim [99023] *Property Holdings Group Pty Ltd v Rosehill Panorama Pty Ltd (in its capacity as trustee of the Rosehill Panorama Unit Trust)*
Words and phrases — "shall"

Service issues to date

Service BP 190 — July 2009	Service BP 221 — August 2014
Service BP 191 — September 2009	Service BP 222 — October 2014
Service BP 192 — November 2009	Service BP 223 — December 2014
Service BP 193 — December 2009	Service BP 224 — March 2015
Service BP 194 — March 2010	Service BP 225 — May 2015
Service BP 195 — May 2010	Service BP 226 — July 2015
Service BP 196 — July 2010	Service BP 227 — September 2015
Service BP 197 — September 2010	Service BP 228 — November 2015
Service BP 198 — November 2010	Service BP 229 — December 2015
Service BP 199 — December 2010	Service BP 230 — February 2016
Service BP 200 — March 2011	Service BP 231 — April 2016
Service BP 201 — May 2011	Service BP 232 — June 2016
Service BP 202 — July 2011	Service BP 233 — August 2016
Service BP 203 — September 2011	Service BP 234 — October 2016
Service BP 204 — November 2011	Service BP 235 — November 2016
Service BP 205 — December 2011	Service BP 236 — December 2016
Service BP 206 — March 2012	Service BP 237 — March 2017
Service BP 207 — May 2012	Service BP 238 — March 2017
Service BP 208 — July 2012	Service BP 239 — August 2017
Service BP 209 — September 2012	Service BP 240 — September 2017
Service BP 210 — November 2012	Service BP 241 — November 2017
Service BP 211 — December 2012	Service BP 242 — December 2017
Service BP 212 — March 2013	Service BP 243 — December 2017
Service BP 213 — May 2013	Service BP 244 — April 2018
Service BP 214 — July 2013	Service BP 245 — April 2018
Service BP 215 — September 2013	Service BP 246 — June 2018
Service BP 216 — November 2013	Service BP 247 — June 2018
Service BP 217 — December 2013	Service BP 248 — September 2018
Service BP 218 — March 2014	Service BP 249 — November 2018
Service BP 219 — May 2014	Service BP 250 — December 2018
Service BP 220 — July 2014	Service BP 251 — December 2018
	Service BP 252 — March 2019
	Service BP 253 — May 2019

Service issues to date — continued

Service BP 254 — June 2019
Service BP 255 — July 2019
Service BP 256 — September 2019
Service BP 257 — October 2019
Service BP 258 — November 2019
Service BP 259 — December 2019
Service BP 260 — March 2020
Service BP 261 — April 2020
Service BP 262 — June 2020
Service BP 263 — August 2020
Service BP 264 — August 2020
Service BP 265 — September 2020
Service BP 266 — October 2020
Service BP 267 — November 2020
Service BP 268 — November 2020
Service BP 269 — December 2020
Service BP 270 — December 2020
Service BP 271 — September 2021
Service BP 272 — September 2021
Service BP 273 — October 2021
Service BP 274 — November 2021
Service BP 275 — December 2021
Service BP 276 — February 2022
Service BP 277 — May 2022
Service BP 278 — May 2022
Service BP 279 — July 2022
Service BP 280 — August 2022
Service BP 281 — November 2022
Service BP 282 — December 2022
Service BP 283 — December 2022
Service BP 284 — May 2023
Service BP 285 — June 2023
Service BP 286 — July 2023
Service BP 287 — September 2023
Service BP 288 — September 2023
Service BP 289 — December 2023
Service BP 290 — December 2023
Service BP 291 — October 2024
Service BP 292 — October 2024
Service BP 293 — February 2025
Service BP 294 — March 2025
Service BP 295 — March 2025

Conveyancing

Filing Instructions for Service 295

IMPORTANT

HAVE YOU FILED SERVICE 294: March 2025?

BEFORE filing this issue, check the FILING RECORD under the **Filing Instructions** Guide Card to ensure that Service 294 has been filed.

SERVICE 295

The new binder **21 BPR 15 Casenotes** is now your “current” binder.

To file this issue you will need “21 BPR 15 Casenotes”

21 BPR 15 CASENOTES

	Remove old pages	Insert new pages
<i>Guide card</i>		
Casenotes 15	21,015–21,018	21,015–21,018
	21,215–21,216	21,215–21,216
	21,295–21,296	21,295–21,296
	21,335–21,336	21,335–21,338
<i>Guide card</i>		
21 BPR	44,001–44,012	44,001–44,012
	—	44,561–44,696

Please remove Filing Instructions for Service BP 294 March 2025 from the **Filing Instructions** Guide Card and insert these pages: Filing Instructions for Service BP 295 March 2025.