

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

## Family Law Reports

Chiles v Petrenko (FedCFamC1A — Tree J) (2024) **69.96**Deleon v Deleon (FedCFamC2F — Judge Dickson) (2023) **69.27**

**Duarte v Morse (No 4) (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2024) 69.147**

**Jess v Jess (No 5) (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2024) 69.122**

**Luan v Luan (FedCFamC2F — Judge Blake) (2023) 69.111**

Rader v Haines (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2023) **69.1**Shams v Alkaios (No 2) (FedCFamC2F — Judge Glass) (2024) **69.71**

**Waldmann v Paddock (FedCFamC1A — McClelland DCJ) (2024) 69.196**

Wei v Xia (FedCFamC1A — Full Court) (2024) **69.37**

**Wood v Delta Legal Pty Ltd (WASC — Forrester J) (2024) 69.166**

## CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

Aon Risk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University (2009) 239 CLR 175; 258 ALR 14; [2009] HCA 27, applied 69.147  
Apache Northwest Pty Ltd v Newcrest Mining Ltd (2009) 182 FCR 124; [2009] FCAFC 39, followed 69.122

Brisbane South Regional Health Authority v Taylor (1996) 186 CLR 541; 139 ALR 1, applied 69.196  
Brown v Talbot & Olivier (1993) 9 WAR 70, applied 69.166

Carr v Finance Corp of Australia Ltd (No 1) (1981) 147 CLR 246; 34 ALR 449, applied 69.122  
Commonwealth v John Fairfax & Sons Ltd (1980) 147 CLR 39; 32 ALR 485, applied 69.122

DL v R (2018) 266 CLR 1; 356 ALR 197; [2018] HCA 26, applied 69.122

Foundas and Arambatzis [2020] NSWCA 47, followed 69.111

Hall v Nominal Defendant (1966) 117 CLR 423; [1966] ALR 705, applied 69.122  
Hardwick v Hardwick (2022) FLC 94-126; [2022] FedCFamC1A 216, followed 69.196  
Hearne v Street (2008) 235 CLR 125; 248 ALR 609; [2008] HCA 36, applied 69.122

ICM Agriculture Pty Ltd v Commonwealth (2009) 240 CLR 140; 261 ALR 653; [2009] HCA 51, distinguished 69.147

In the Marriage of D R and L A Carlon (1982) 8 Fam LR 729; (1982) FLC 91-272, followed 69.196  
In the Marriage of R W and P B Althaus (1979) 8 Fam LR 169; (1982) FLC 91-233, followed 69.196

Jovetic v Stoddart & Co (1992) 7 WAR 208, followed 69.166

Krueger v Krueger (2023) 68 Fam LR 107; [2023] FedCFamC1A 203, followed 69.196

Law Society of New South Wales v Foreman (1994) 34 NSWLR 408, applied 69.166  
Licul v Corney (1976) 180 CLR 213; 8 ALR 437, applied 69.122

McIver v Australian Capital Territory [2024] ACTSC 112, approved 69.196  
Medlow v Medlow (2016) 54 Fam LR 389; (2016) FLC 93-692; [2016] FamCAFC 34, applied 69.122

O'Brien v Komesaroff (1982) 150 CLR 310; 41 ALR 255, applied 69.122

Penrith Whitewater Stadium Ltd and Lesvos Pty Ltd [2007] NSWCA 103, followed 69.122

R v Mr Justice R S Watson, a judge of the Family Court of Australia; Ex parte Armstrong (1976) 136 CLR 248; 9 ALR 551; 1 Fam LR 11,297, applied 69.196

—v Ross Jones; Ex parte Beaumont (1979) 141 CLR 504; 23 ALR 179; 4 Fam LR 598, applied 69.147

Re Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs; Ex parte Lam (2003) 214 CLR 1; 195 ALR 502; 72 ALD 613; [2003] HCA 6, applied 69.122

RnD Funding Pty Ltd v Roncane Pty Ltd (2023) 297 FCR 91; 411 ALR 1; [2023] FCAFC 28, applied 69.122

Russell v Russell (1976) 134 CLR 495; 9 ALR 103; 1 Fam LR 11,133, applied 69.147

Stead v State Government Insurance Commission (1986) 161 CLR 141; 67 ALR 21; 4 MVR 542, applied 69.122

Sharp v Sharp (2011) 50 Fam LR 567; [2011] FamCAFC 150, followed 69.196

Skelton v Lindop (2022) 64 Fam LR 617; [2022] FedCFamC1A 47, followed 69.196

Stevenson v Zafra Pty Ltd [2021] WASCA 181, applied 69.166

SZBEL v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (2006) 228 CLR 152; 231 ALR 592; 93 ALD 300; [2006] HCA 63, applied 69.122, 69.147

Tame v New South Wales (2002) 211 CLR 317; 191 ALR 449; 36 MVR 1; [2002] HCA 35, applied 69.122

V and S [2006] FCWA 2, approved 69.196

*(Continues on p iii of cover)*

**CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART** — *continued*

Whisprun Pty Ltd v Dixon (2003) 200 ALR 447; [2003] HCA 48, applied 69.122

**STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART**

<b>COMMONWEALTH CONSTITUTION</b>		r 10.26 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>
Commonwealth Constitution		r 10.27 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>
s 51 . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	r 15.19 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>
s 51(xxxi) . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	Federal Court and Federal Circuit and Family Court Regulations 2022	
<b>COMMONWEALTH</b>		r 4.02 . . . . .	<b>69.122</b>
Family Law Act 1975		Judiciary Act 1903	
Pt VIII . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	s 79 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>
Pt XIV . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	<b>NEW SOUTH WALES</b>	
s 44(5) . . . . .	<b>69.196</b>	Conveyancing Act 1919	
s 44(6) . . . . .	<b>69.196</b>	s 66G . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>
s 79 . . . . .	<b>69.111, 69.147</b>	<b>WESTERN AUSTRALIA</b>	
s 80 . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	Legal Profession Act 2008	
s 81 . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	s 260 . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
s 90SM . . . . .	<b>69.196</b>	s 260(1) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
s 114 . . . . .	<b>69.147</b>	s 260(1)(a) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
s 117 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>	s 260(1)(c) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Family Law) Rules 2021		s 260(1)(f) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
r 1.33 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>	s 288(2) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
r 1.34 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>	s 288(3) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>
r 10.02 . . . . .	<b>69.111</b>	s 288(3)(c) . . . . .	<b>69.166</b>

## INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

### APPEALS

**Leave to appeal** — Discovery and inspection — Stay of orders: *Jess v Jess (No 5)* 69 Fam LR 122

### JURISDICTION

**Practice and procedure** — Bankruptcy — Where wife sought orders under s 79 of Family Law Act — Where wife was in breach of trial directions — Where wife sought to discontinue proceedings — Where court's power to make orders as sought by second respondent could only be enlivened upon exercise of federal jurisdiction — Whether to dismiss wife's application and/or to orders costs against wife was exercise of federal jurisdiction: *Luan v Luan* 69 Fam LR 111

### LEGAL PRACTITIONERS

**Costs agreements** — Applications to set aside cost agreements — Whether costs agreement was not fair or reasonable — Whether law practice failed to comply with written disclosure obligations — Relevance of verbal disclosure given by law practice — Relevance of plaintiff's vulnerability as client seeking assistance in complicated family law dispute — Relevance of lack of information contained on invoices and lack of regular invoicing: *Wood v Delta Legal Pty Ltd* 69 Fam LR 166

### PROPERTY SETTLEMENT

**Appeals** — Whether primary judge erred by refusing appellant's request to adjourn final hearing — Whether statutory power to alter property rights of parties to marriage were unconstitutional — Whether statutory power to alter property rights of parties to marriage could not be exercised when parties have already voluntarily ended their financial relationships — Whether appellant was justly compensated for rights she claims were forfeited under primary judge's orders: *Duarte v Morse (No 4)* 69 Fam LR 147

**Leave to apply out of time** — Where primary judge granted leave to de facto wife to apply for property settlement more than 2 years after expiry of standard application period — Whether primary judge gave no, or inadequate, reasons in relation to her findings that de facto wife had prima facie case and that de facto wife would suffer hardship if leave were not granted — Re-exercise of discretion: *Waldmann v Paddack* 69 Fam LR 196