

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Family Law Reports

Adair v Adair (FedCFamC2F — Judge Betts) (2021)	64.533
Agambar v Agambar (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021)	64.152
Arcand v Boen (FamCAFC — Full Court) (2021)	64.141
Banham v Banham (FamCAFC — Strickland J) (2021)	64.361
Beckert v Beckert (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021)	64.218
Blann v Kenny (FamCAFC — Full Court) (2021)	64.120
Bonner v Chandler (FedCFamC1A — Austin J) (2021)	64.546
Charisteas v Charisteas (HCA — Full Court) (2021)	64.94
Christie v Galipo (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021)	64.300
Eccleston v Eccleston (FedCFamC2F — Alstergren CJ) (2021)	64.419
Glover v Webster (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021)	64.482
Grimmond v Hartin (FedCFamC1F — Berman J) (2021)	64.398
Hedlund v Hedlund (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021)	64.458
Jaeger v Gaspari (FCCA — Judge W J Neville) (2021)	64.53

(Continues on p ii of cover)

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED — *continued*

Kain v Kain (FamCA — Wilson J) (2020) **64.1**

Langley v Tarelli (No 3) (FedCFamC1A — Austin J) (2021) **64.541**
Lao v Zeng (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021) **64.332**
Lawson v Glenning (FedCFamC2F — Judge Riethemuller) (2021) **64.414**
Lombardi v Rider (FedCFamC2F — Chief Judge Alstergren) (2021) **64.103**
Loncar v Loncar (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021) **64.446**

Mayson v Wellard (FamCAFC — Full Court) (2021) **64.111**

Parris v Parris (FedCFamC2F — Judge A Kelly) (2021) **64.165**

Safar v Malouf (FamCA — Wilson J) (2021) **64.68**
Secretary, Commonwealth Attorney-General’s Department v Bashir (FamCAFC — Full Court)
(2021) **64.386**
Secretary, Department of Communities and Justice v Oponui (FedCFamC1A — Full Court)
(2021) **64.426**
Shipman v Shipman (FamCA — Altobelli J) (2021) **64.75**
Strahan v Strahan (FamCAFC — Full Court) (2021) **64.89**

Thorpe v Stirling (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021) **64.511**
Tomaras v Tomaras (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021) **64.237**

Valder v Saklani (FamCAFC — Full Court) (2021) **64.375**

Welland v Hawthorn (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2021) **64.520**
Woodcock v Woodcock (FedCFamC1F — Wilson J) (2021) **64.489**
Wright v Rebane (FedCFamC1F — Wilson J) (2021) **64.287**

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

- Aldridge v Keaton (2009) 42 Fam LR 369; (2009) FLC ¶93-421; [2009] FamCAFC 299, considered 64.546
- Arcand v Boen (2021) 64 Fam LR 141; (2021) FLC 94-046; [2021] FamCAFC 155, applied 64.520
- Bacall v Zagar [2020] FamCA 350, followed 64.489
- Commonwealth v Mullane (1961) 106 CLR 166; [1962] ALR 67, considered 64.546
- Crawford v Timms [2020] NSWSC 380, considered 64.533
- DJL v Central Authority (2000) 201 CLR 226; 170 ALR 659; [2000] HCA 17, followed 64.541
- Driclad Pty Ltd v Federal Commissioner of Taxation (1986) 121 CLR 45, considered 64.546
- Edmunds v Edmunds (2018) 58 Fam LR 76; (2018) FLC 93-847, followed 64.520
- EJK v TSL (2006) 35 Fam LR 559; (2006) FLC 93-287; [2006] FamCA 730, followed 64.458
- Esso Australia Pty Ltd v Australian Workers Union [2020] FCA 316, followed 64.489
- Esso Australia Resources Ltd v Plowman (Minister for Energy and Minerals) (1995) 183 CLR 10; 128 ALR 391, considered 64.533
- Flanagan and Hancock (2001) 27 Fam LR 615; (2001) FLC 93-074; [2000] Fam CA 150, followed 64.458
- Gronow v Gronow (1979) 144 CLR 513; 29 ALR 129; 5 Fam LR 719, followed 64.520
- Hearne v Street (2008) 235 CLR 125; 248 ALR 609; [2008] HCA 36, followed 64.533
- House v R (1936) 55 CLR 499, followed 64.520
- In the Marriage of Bennet (2001) 28 Fam LR 231; (2001) FLC 93-088; [2001] FamCA 462, followed 64.458
- In the Marriage of C K and I W Kennon (1997) 22 Fam LR 1; (1997) FLC 92-757, explained 64.446
- In the Marriage of Guirguis and the Official Trustee in Bankruptcy (1997) 21 Fam LR 356; (1997) FLC 92-726, considered 64.482
- In the Marriage of J T and M L Collins (1977) 4 Fam LR 11,424; (1977) FLC 90-286, considered 64.511
- In the Marriage of J U and T Poletti (1990) 15 Fam LR 794, considered 64.511
- In the Marriage of N and S I Jacemko (1986) Fam LR 341; (1986) FLC 91-776, followed 64.520
- In the Marriage of P and A Neocleous (1993) 16 Fam LR 577; (1993) FLC 92-377, followed 64.520
- In the Marriage of P G and B J Marsh (1993) 17 Fam LR 289; (1994) FLC 92-443, distinguished 64.446
- Jennings Constructions Ltd v Burgundy Royale Investments Pty Ltd (1986) 161 CLR 681; 69 ALR 265, considered 64.541
- John Fairfax & Sons Ltd v Kelly (No 2) (1987) 8 NSWLR 510, considered 64.541
- Kennon v Spry (2008) 238 CLR 366; 251 ALR 257; 40 Fam LR 1; [2008] HCA 56, applied 64.489
- Lovell v Lovell (1950) 81 CLR 513; [1950] ALR 944, followed 64.520
- Maldera v Orbel (2014) 52 Fam LR 42; (2014) FLC 83-602; [2014] FamCAFC 135, considered 64.546
- v Orbel (2014) 52 Fam LR 42; (2014) FLC 83-602; [2014] FamCAFC 135, considered 64.546
- Medlow v Medlow (2016) 54 Fam LR 389; (2016) FLC 93-692; [2016] FamCAFC 34, considered 64.520
- Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs v B (2004) 219 CLR 365; 206 ALR 130; 31 Fam LR 339; [2004] HCA 20, followed 64.541
- Mobil Oil Australia Ltd v Guina Developments Pty Ltd [1996] 2 VR 34; (1995) 33 IPR 83, applied 64.489
- Mullane v Mullane (1983) 158 CLR 436; 45 ALR 291; 8 Fam LR 777, considered 64.511
- Re Q (Damages for sexual assault) (1994) 18 Fam LR 442; (1995) FLC 92-565, distinguished 64.446

(Continues on p iv of cover)

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART — *continued*

Secretary of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment v Blacktown City Council [2021] NSWCA 145, applied 64.489

Spencer v Spencer (No 4) [2020] FamCAFC 254, considered 64.541

Valentine v Lacerra (2013) 49 Fam LR 244; (2013) FLC ¶93-539; [2013] FamCAFC 53, considered 64.546

W and W; R and G (by their next friend P) (Intervener) (1994) 17 Fam LR 751; (1994) FLC 92-475, distinguished 64.446

STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH

Family Law Act 1975	64.458	Pt VII	64.446, 64.541, 64.546
s 44	64.520	Pt VIII	64.489, 64.541
s 64B	64.458	Pt VIIIAB	64.520
s 65H	64.458	Family Law Rules 2004	
s 68B	64.458	r 17.02(1)(a)	64.541
s 75(2)(b)	64.446	Federal Circuit and Family Court of	
s 75(2)(o)	64.446	Australia (Family Law) Rules	
s 79	64.489, 64.511	2021	
s 79(4)	64.446	r 10.13(1)(a)	64.541
s 82(4)	64.511	Federal Circuit and Family Court of	
s 83	64.511	Australia Act 2021	
s 90SM	64.482	s 26	64.458
s 94(2)	64.541	s 32	64.541
s 117	64.520	Federal Circuit and Family Court of	
s 121	64.533	Australia Rules 2021	
		r 6.04	64.533

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

APPEALS

Family law — Application — Stay — Stay of Full Court orders — Set aside orders — Interim injunction: *Langley v Tarelli (No 3)* 64 Fam LR 541

Injunctions — Where primary judge made injunctions for welfare of children and also purported to make personal protection order (PPO) in apparent attempt to reproduce injunctions in form similar to orders made under state legislation — Whether PPO should be set aside on basis that it does not reflect relevant injunctions — Whether injunctions made for welfare of children are parenting orders — Whether final injunctions made for welfare of children were beyond power on basis that they would continue to be in force after children became adults — Whether final injunctions preventing any contact between father and children are manifestly unreasonable: *Hedlund v Hedlund* 64 Fam LR 458

Property — Leave to bring proceedings out of time — Hardship — Explanation for delay — Leave to appeal — Substantial injustice — Costs: *Welland v Hawthorn* 64 Fam LR 520

FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS

Bankruptcy — Where primary judge made declarations binding financial agreement on parties — Where appellant appealed declaration — Where appellant became bankrupt — Whether appellant had standing to appeal — Whether bankrupt appellant lacked sufficient interest to prosecute appeal: *Glover v Webster* 64 Fam LR 482

ORDERS

Appeal — Appeal against enforcement orders requiring appellant husband to make payments due and owing under order — Where respondent wife remarried — Whether order is characterised as property settlement order or spousal maintenance order: *Thorpe v Stirling* 64 Fam LR 511

PARENTING ORDERS

Appeal — Appeal against orders made by magistrate — Where magistrate dismissed appellant's application for appointment of single expert witness — Where magistrate dismissed interlocutory application for children to spend supervised time with appellant — Whether appealed order procedural ruling and not amenable to appeal — Whether magistrate fell into error by dismissing application because respondent jointly opposed children spending time with appellant — Whether importance of respondent's parental authority and responsibility improperly elevated in way which inconsistent with law: *Bonner v Chandler* 64 Fam LR 546

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Subpoenas — Where wife (W) issued subpoenas which sought production of trust deeds and other relevant documents concerning trusts of which husband (H) was potential beneficiary — Where H and corporate trustees objected to subpoenas — Assessment of apparent relevance of documents sought to be produced by subpoenas — Whether subpoenas should be set aside on basis that they contain confidential information of third parties who were not joined to proceedings — Whether subpoenas should be set aside because W had been given redacted copies of relevant documents — Whether subpoenas were abuse of process because they were being used as improper substitute for discovery — Whether subpoenas were inappropriate fishing expedition: *Woodcock v Woodcock* 64 Fam LR 489

PROPERTY SETTLEMENT

Appeals — Where primary judge concluded that wife's (W) contributions were made much more arduous as result of family violence by husband (H) — Where primary judge therefore assessed parties relative contributions as 57.5/42.5 in favour of W — Where primary judge made further 10% adjustment in favour of W on account of prospective factors — Whether primary judge erred in failing to properly consider W's overall contributions — Whether primary judge's adjustment of 10% on account of prospective factors was unreasonable and plainly unjust — Whether primary judge should have ignored 7.5% uplift in W's contribution-based assessment when determining what adjustment should be made for prospective factors in circumstances where uplift was made because of family violence perpetrated by H: *Loncar v Loncar* 64 Fam LR 446

Appeals — Where primary judge's property settlement orders required mother (M) to sell property to realise funds to pay father \$5000 in satisfaction of his share of net assets, without giving M initial opportunity to raise cash in some other way than by sale of property — Whether primary judge's order was manifestly unreasonable: *Hedlund v Hedlund* 64 Fam LR 458

(Continues on p viii of cover)

INDEX — *continued*

PUBLICATION

Affidavits — Property settlement proceedings finalised — Application for leave to publish affidavits
in criminal proceeding — Implied undertaking: *Adair v Adair* 64 Fam LR 533